ial

Issues in Applied Linguistics

SPECIAL ISSUE
NONNATIVE DISCOURSE

ial

Issues in Applied Linguistics

ial

Issues in Applied Linguistics

Volume 11 Number 1 • June 2000

CONTENTS

ial

BOOK REVIEWS

Editorial

This is a special theme issue focusing on nonnative discourse. In addition to our general issues that publish a wide range of applied linguistics research, from time to time *ial* publishes special thematic issues to bring together emerging research and perspectives on particular areas of applied linguistics. Special topics in the past have included neurobiology of language, ethical issues of applying linguistics, applied linguistics and education, applied linguistics from an East Asian perspective, sociolinguistics and language minorities, discourse based perspectives on second language acquisition, and the organization of participation.

This issue's focus, nonnative discourse, is motivated in part by an increasing interest among applied linguists in looking at the details of nonnative speaker participation in interaction in natural social contexts, including such research perspectives as micro-ethnography and ethnography of speaking (Rampton, 1995; van Lier, 1988), socio-cultural theory (Hall, 1993; Lantolf & Appel, 1994; Ohta, in press), and conversation analysis (Markee, 2000). There have also been challenges to psychometric and experimental SLA research posed from an ethnomethodological perspective (Markee, 1994; Firth & Wagner, 1997) and discussion of the ways micro-sociological approaches to interaction intersect with notions of context in SLA (Tarone, 2000).

In recent years, research in conversation analysis has increasingly expanded from its roots in ordinary conversation to include research on interaction in institutional contexts such as doctor-patient interactions, courtroom discourse, 911 emergency calls, and classroom discourse (Drew & Heritage, 1993), and conversation analytic work has also emerged on interaction and language disorders (Wootton, 1997).

At the same time, many societies around the world are becoming increasingly multilingual and multicultural due to immigration, international business, and electronic communications. Interactions involving nonnative speakers are an everyday occurrence in the US and many countries where people of various cultural and linguistic backgrounds come into contact, not only in schools and government offices, but across the work and social dimensions of day to day life. While research on cross-cultural communication, foreigner talk, interlanguage pragmatics, and genre analysis offers valuable insights, there is still little research on the micro-interactional organization of encounters between nonnative speakers and their co-participants as they unfold in everyday life. It is our hope that the research brought together in this issue will make a contribution to our understanding of nonnative discourse and help to stimulate interest in further research across a variety of social contexts.

As a step toward the understanding of naturally occurring nonnative speaker interactions, this issue includes research on diverse kinds of speakers and discourse: it includes research looking at both native speaker-nonnative speaker (NS-NNS) interaction, which is by its nature cross-cultural communication, and nonnative speaker-nonnative speaker (NNS-NNS) interaction, or *lingua franca* talk; it includes both conversational and institutional discourse; it includes nonnative speakers of English and Japanese; and it includes data collected in foreign language and second language contexts. Mardi Kidwell looks at interactions between ESL students and English speaking staff at the front desk of a language institute. Yuri Hosoda looks at Japanese conversations between native and nonnative speaking peers. Donald Carroll looks at English conversations among Japanese low level English students in Japan. The fact that all the articles are conversation analytic in approach provides a unified focus for the issue, though this is a result of serendiptity, more an artifact of how the issue naturally evolved, than any editorial plan. The interview with Schegloff on issues regarding the use of conversation analysis to study nonnative discourse rounds out this special issue, and further contributes to an overall theme of conversation analysis and nonnative discourse. David Olsher's introduction to the issue considers the nonnative discourse theme in the context of a broad range applied linguistics research and makes a case for an expanded body of research that is guided by a micro-interactional perspective on nonnative discourse, rather than in service of other research areas.

While we feel that conversation analysis is a valuable analytic tool for studying talk and interaction with much to contribute to our understanding of nonnative discourse, we want to emphasize that the purpose of this issue is to encourage research on the details of naturally occurring nonnative discourse more generally, including, for example, work from the perspectives of linguistic anthropology and the ethnography of communication.

Our upcoming general issue (December, 2000) promises to include articles reflecting a wide range of applied linguistic research interests. We are currently considering future special theme issues on areas that have not been so well represented in *ial* in recent years, such as language assessment, language acquisition, language disorders, and language policy. As a student-run publication housed in a department of applied linguistics, we hope to bring forward a wide range of research ideas and approaches, with a continued emphasis on interdisciplinary work. We also see it as part of our mission to foster the development of graduate students and new researchers, so we welcome your submissions and ideas for future issues.

June 2000   David Olsher
                                                          Leah Wingard

REFERENCES

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal, 81,* 285-300.

Hall, J. K. (1993). The role of oral practices in the accomplishment of our everyday lives: The sociocultural dimension of interaction with implications for the learning of another language. *Applied Linguistics, 14,* 145-166.

Lantolf, J. P., & Appel, G. (Eds.). (1994).*Vygotskian approaches to second language research.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Markee, N. (1994). Toward an ethnomethodological respecification of second-language acquisition studies. In E. E. Tarone, S. M. Gass and A. D. Cohen (Eds.), *Research methodology in second language acquisition* (pp. 89-116). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ohta, A. S. (in press). *Second language acquisition processes in the classroom: Learning Japanese.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents.* London: Longman.

Tarone, E. (2000). Still wrestling with "Context" in interlanguage theory. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 20,* 182-198.

van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner.* London: Longman.

Wootton, A. J. (1997). *Interaction and the development of mind.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Introduction: Nonnative Discourse

David Olsher
University of California, Los Angeles

> ...understanding how nonnative speaking participants make
> their way in interaction needs to start with what is generally the case
> in the talk and other conduct in interaction...
>
> —Schemgloff, 2000, p. 234

This special issue of *ial* on nonnative discourse includes new conversation analytic research as well as an interview of Emanuel Scheloff addressing theoretical and methodological considerations in using conversation analysis to study nonnative discourse.[1] Conversation analysis (CA) is an ethnomethodological branch of sociology which views the micro-interactional practices of naturally occurring talk-in-interaction as fundamental social structures that are susceptible, via recording and transcription, to detailed empirical analysis. Though CA has been a part of the interdisciplinary community of applied linguistics for many years, only in recent years has a body of CA research on nonnative discourse begun to emerge. As will be discussed below, there has also been growing discussion of the ways that CA may be used to critique or contribute to various areas of applied linguistics. The articles in this issue focus on the sequential organization and turn-taking practices in nonnative discourse.

The term *nonnative discourse* is used here to refer to talk and interaction in which one or more participants are not native speakers of the language being used. Nonnative discourse includes a diversity of languages spoken, linguistic and cultural backgrounds of participants, configurations of speakers, and social and cultural contexts of interaction. The scope of what may be considered as nonnative discourse is reflected in the articles in this issue, which include native-nonnative speaker (NS-NNS) interaction—a kind of intercultural communication—as well as nonnative-nonnative speaker (NNS-NNS) interaction— which may also be considered *lingua franca* talk. The articles include analysis of English as well as Japanese discourse, foreign language as well as second language contexts, and casual conversation as well as talk in an institutional context.

One domain of nonnative discourse that has been the focus of substantial research is teacher-fronted classroom interaction, building on the work of Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) and Mehan (1979, 1985), among others. As a practical choice for this special issue, teacher-fronted classroom discourse was excluded from the scope of research considered in order to provide a forum for research on nonnative speaker interaction in a range of other contexts, including casual conversation as

well as interaction in various other educational and institutional settings. This choice was not based on any notion that teacher-fronted lessons are less real or important than what goes on in other institutional settings, such as doctor office visits or job interviews. In fact, the expansion of the contexts in which we study nonnative discourse may, ultimately, contribute to our understanding of nonnative speaker participation in teacher-fronted educational interactions.

Given the diverse and at times conflicting applied linguistics research agendas, methodologies, and epistemological stances surrounding the study of second language acquisition and interlanguage, this issue of *ial* focuses on nonnative speaker talk-in-interaction as a research focus in its own right, as part of the social and cultural fabric of the world, a domain worthy of understanding even apart from the concerns language educators, testers, and acquisition theorists. Nonnative discourse *happens,* it is a fact of life, and it is worth investigating from a discourse perspective, within its indigenous social and interactional habitats. Of course, such research is likely to contribute to our understanding of the communicative competence, and in particular the interactional competence, of nonnative speakers. Broadly speaking, research on nonnative discourse is concerned with communicative competence in socially situated communication. The point is that this research may find its own questions in the examination of the data of talk and the social action of which it is a part.

What, then, are the issues in studying nonnative discourse? The basic underlying questions include: 1) What are the discursive practices, sequential organization, and patterns of participation we find in nonnative discourse? 2) How do these practices and organizational patterns differ from what is found in native speaker interaction? 3) Are there practices associated with speakers from particular linguistic or cultural backgrounds, particular languages of communication, or particular social contexts? 4) How and when are the cultural and social identities of native and nonnative speakers manifested in the discursive practices of nonnative speaker interaction? Of course these are very broad questions, ones which need not be the starting point of empirical investigations. Certainly, from a conversation analytic perspective, the research should begin with observations of actual data rather than with a series of questions. These questions more generally describe a domain of interest and may be considered from a variety of perspectives, including a sociological interest in the organization of talk and social action, an anthropological interest in discursive practices as a locus of culture, or a functional interest in the role of linguistic structures in social context.

Ultimately, a broader and more detailed understanding of nonnative speaker interaction may inform studies of interlanguage use and development, assessment and pedagogy. The articles in this issue should certainly be seen in the context of the ongoing research areas of applied linguistics, even if the authors do not situate their studies *within* these areas.

APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND NONNATIVE DISCOURSE

Insights from discourse analysis have long played a part in applied linguistic research. Varieties of discourse analysis including linguistic pragmatics, coherence and cohesion, speech act theory, and CA have, over the years, been exploited by researchers in the study of second (or foreign) language acquisition, language assessment, and language use. Much of this work has been influenced, at least in part, by models of communicative competence (Bachman, 1990; Canale & Swain, 1980; Hymes, 1972), and more recently researchers have begun to advocate a focus on interactional competence (He & Young, 1998; Markee, 2000).

Interlanguage pragmatics is one research area concerned with the acquisition of the social uses of language; a primary focus is on the use and acquisition of social, pragmatic, and linguistic aspects of speech act behavior (such as requesting, apologizing, or complaining) by nonnative speakers, compared to a baseline of native—or highly proficient nonnative—speaker norms (e.g., Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993). Though most interlanguage pragmatics research has been carried out through the elicitation of written reports of hypothetical discourse choices rather than through the study of naturally occurring talk-in-interaction, researchers in the field have also expressed an interest in the sequential organization of speech act behavior that can only be studied through an examination of spontaneous spoken discourse (Kasper & Dahl, 1991).

Discourse has been a major interest in second language acquisition (SLA) research as well. Focus on the role of spoken interaction in the acquisition of linguistic structures dates back to Hatch's 1976 discourse theory and proposals about the value ofnegotiation of meaning for SLA (Long, 1983; Long & Porter, 1985; Varonis & Gass, 1985). SLA researchers have been interested in spoken communication for the kinds of input, output (Swain, 1985), or interaction that are thought to facilitate acquisition. Recently, some researchers have also begun to focus on the role of language play (such as jokes, riddles, rhymes, and word games) in acquisition (e.g., Cook, 2000; Tarone, 1999); though language play may include highly organized and ritualized activities, one of its indigenous habitats is talk-in-interaction in everyday life. What characterizes most research on discourse from SLA perspectives is a theoretically defined interest in particular qualities or elements of discourse that are deemed valuable for acquisition, rather than a primary interest in their part in the situated, natural use of language. An orientation to isolating factors that promote acquisition also extends to considerations of social context. According to Tarone (2000), the main focus of interlanguage research on social context is on the "impact of social factors on the psycholinguistic processes of acquisition of specific interlanguage morphosyntactic, lexical, and phonological forms" (p. 193). While there is an interest in discourse and social context in such SLA research, an *a priori* selection and attempt to isolate variables generally cannot take into consideration the participants' orientations to—and local, interactional construction of—the discourse and social context.

Discourse analytic perspectives on nonnative interaction have also been connected with language acquisition in recent years is through a critique of traditional SLA methodology from the perspectives of ethnomethodology and conversation analysis (Markee, 1994; Firth & Wagner, 1996) and sociolinguistics and ethnography of speaking (Rampton, 1995). These critiques have stimulated a debate over, on the one hand, whether traditional psychometric approaches to SLA research can properly account for the ways language is used by NNS in sequentially and socially situated social contexts, and on the other hand, what exactly micro-analytic and ethnographic tools of discourse analysis can contribute to understandings of the psycholinguistic process of language acquisition (e.g., Firth & Wagner, 1997; Gass, 1998; Kasper, 1997a; Long, 1997),

Also related to this debate are socially situated views of language acquisition. Vygotskian approaches to language learning, or socio-cultural theory (Hall, 1993; Lantolf & Appel, 1994) have focused attention on learning as a social process, with a major emphasis on the notion of "scaffolding," and the social practices that foster language learning. While some of this work has turned its attention primarily to theory, studies have also focused on the discursive practices in interaction in educational contexts. Another strand of acquisition research concerned with discourse of language learners is the field of language socialization, a research domain originally concerned with child language development (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1986), but which has been taken up by researchers concerned with second language learning as well, including Poole (1992), and Ohta (in press), who integrates a Vygotskian view with a language socialization perspective on the role of interactional routines in language learning. Situated communication is a primary focus of language socialization, so research on second language learning from this perspective is naturally tied to the close analysis of interactions involving nonnative speakers.

Recently, some researchers have made a case for ways in which conversation analysis may be able to contribute to the further development of SLA. Markee (2000) argues that conversation analysis of second language data can help to ground empirical claims about language learning and social interaction and can reveal "important details of the SLA landscape that other methodologies would otherwise leave blank" (p. 162). In a study of delayed next-turn repair initiation by nonnative speakers, Wong (2000a) suggests that attention to turn taking, sequential organization of talk, and adjacency—as opposed to a focus on linguistic forms—may be able to contribute to interactionist SLA research since it can provide a grounding for claims about the interactional understandings that are demonstrated by the participants to one another within interactions (p. 264).

Micro-interactional analysis of naturally occurring nonnative discourse has been argued to be relevant in other areas of applied linguistics as well, including language assessment (Jacoby & McNamara, 1999)—and in particular the oral as-

sessment interview (e.g., Egbert, 1998; He, 1998; Riggenbach, 1998)—as well as the study of communication strategies (Firth & Wagner, 1997; Rampton, 1997). Overall, a thematic focus on nonnative discourse can be seen as relevant to a wide range of research areas in applied linguistics.

PROBLEMS WITH THE NOTION OF NONNATIVE DISCOURSE

What is being advocated here is an agenda of research on nonnative discourse which may be relevant to the concerns of other areas of applied linguistics but which evolves independently of the orientations and research questions of prior work in SLA and other fields. The notion of *nonnative* discourse itself, however, carries with it assumptions that can be problematic. First of all, the term itself encodes a bipolar, *native* versus *nonnative* speaker distinction rooted in the primary interest of applied linguistics and second and foreign language education. This term provides a useful way to distinguish the learning and use of a mother tongue from the learning and use of additional languages, but it also may be seen as over-simplifying the reality of a diverse range of speakers, and even the complex reality of individual speakers as they participate in talk and social interaction. Schegloff (this issue) cautions against the danger of nonnative speaker identity being simply "insisted" into the data by the predispositions of researchers without concern for the particular practices and orientations of the participants.

In fact, language researchers with a variety of perspectives have questioned the label of nonnative speaker. From the viewpoint of interlanguage pragmatics, Kasper (1997b, c) has questioned whether the notion of a native speaker is valid as a standard against which the communicative competence of language learners should be measured, because by its very nature it sets an unrealistic, if not impossible, goal and frames the language learner as inherently deficient. Moreover, Carroll (this issue) criticizes the nonnative speaker label, in part because of its uncertain relevance to the participants, but also because of the monolithic nature of the notion of nonnative, which lumps together speakers with a wide range of language abilities. He further raises the objection that in an increasingly multilingual, multicultural world, the notion of the monolingual native speaker itself is something of a myth, and the native/nonnative speaker distinction becomes increasingly murky.[2] To avoid the pitfalls of the nonnative speaker label, Carroll adopts a more specific and informative label—"novice level L2"—for his data.

The concept of nonnative speaker, no matter how we might seek to broaden its focus, encodes an analytic distinction which may oversimplify or misrepresent the complexity of the ways language is used by speakers of various linguistic and cultural backgrounds. In addition, the focus in this issue is limited to interactions conducted more or less exclusively in one language, of which one or more participants are nonnative speakers. Yet, nonnative discourse broadly considered must also include multilingual interactions involving various configurations of speakers with competencies in one or more of the languages being used. If we are to

take up nonnative discourse and or some similar label for framing an area of inquiry, the terminology must be considered critically.

In spite of the limitations of the concept of nonnative discourse, an interest in the ways nonnative speakers and their co-participants interact remains a valuable focus of increasing interest from a variety of disciplinary perspectives. A better understanding of nonnative discourse as social action in the world may shed light on a wide range of issues, including the ways that cultural identities are constituted through discourse, the ways second language learners are socialized into speech communities, the special adaptations of turn taking and sequence organization that occur, the ways intersubjective understandings are achieved and repaired, and the ways linguistic and pragmatic competence become salient within interactions. Workplace ethnography and conversation analytic research on discourse in institutional settings may shed light on the ways nonnative speakers navigate the discourse contexts and institutional constraints of workplace tasks, medical encounters, small group work in language classrooms, and a variety of other settings. A diverse body of research that focuses on speakers of various proficiency levels, mother tongue languages, and second/other languages of interaction may ultimately be of great interest to those concerned with second language learning, use, and education.

IN THIS ISSUE

As stated above, this issue focuses on conversation analysis (CA) as a methodology for studying nonnative discourse. The three articles present original research on nonnative speaker interaction, and the interview with Emanuel Schegloff addresses potential problems and prospects for the application of CA to the study of nonnative discourse. There is a small, but growing body of conversation analytic research on nonnative discourse, including work on NNS-NNS discourse, or *lingua franca* talk (Jordon & Fuller, 1975; Firth, 1996; Wagner & Firth, 1997); repair in NS-NNS talk (Gaskill, 1980; Kurhila, in press; Schwartz, 1980; Wong, 2000a), problems of transcription of nonnative discourse (Jefferson, 1996); language proficiency interviews (Egbert, 1998; He, 1998), ESL writing conference interaction (Koshik, 1999), and on distinctive speaking practices found in NNS talk (Wong, 2000b, in press). Firth (1996) has also raised theoretical and methodological questions about the applicability of CA to nonnative discourse.

The contributions to this special issue on nonnative discourse add new findings to the existing literature and address questions about using CA as a tool for analyzing nonnative discourse. The interview with Professor Schegloff addresses these questions explicitly, while some of the same issues are also addressed in the articles through their hands-on analytic work on the data of different kinds of nonnative speaker interactions.

Concerning the study of nonnative speaker interaction, Schegloff suggests it is best not to work from the assumption that its practices and organization are

fundamentally different than those of interaction among native speakers; instead, he sets it as an empirical question whether, when, and how it becomes relevant in an interaction that a participant is a nonnative speaker. While there may be some differences in the discursive practices of nonnative speakers, Schegloff argues that the concept of *recipient design* is just as useful in this domain as it is has been for understanding other kinds of talk. Recipient design, he explains, concerns not only the ways that speakers design utterances for particular hearers, but also the ways hearers interpret the talk of particular speakers. With regard to uncertainties about analyzing the talk of speakers from other linguistic and cultural backgrounds, Schegloff argues that the organization of talk-in-interaction is fairly robust across cultures and languages, allowing CA researchers at least some access to nonnative speaker data. Uncertainties about individual instances, he suggests, can be addressed by working with collections of particular interactional phenomena.

With regard to what aspects of nonnative discourse seem promising to study from a CA perspective, Schegloff cautions against limiting the scope of inquiry in advance. He advises instead that the focus of such research should emerge from observations made in working closely with the data of recorded interactions, a point very much in harmony with Sacks' (1992) argument for the value of working with recordings of actual talk: practices can be observed that might not otherwise have even been imagined (p. 420). Such an approach to nonnative discourse, making new observations and identifying yet-to-be-described practices of talk-in-interaction, Schegloff suggests, may contribute not only to our understanding of nonnative discourse, but also to the evolving body of conversation analytic work on talk-in-interaction more generally.

The authors in this issue all discuss collections of phenomena found in their data and ground their claims in patterns found in collected cases. The articles reflect two approaches to nonnative discourse. Kidwell approaches nonnative discourse from a micro-sociological interest in talk in institutional settings. Her article examines interactions at the front desk of an English language institute, a setting where nonnative English speaking students regularly interact with native English speaker staff. Analysis focuses on the sequential organization of front desk encounters, revealing ways the participant's shared orientations to the organization and goals of these encounters facilitate NS-NNS interaction. In contrast to research that has focused on communication problems resulting from a lack of shared knowledge or limitations in linguistic competence, Kidwell examines ways that the common ground of shared expectations about front desk encounters fosters the successful transaction of school-related business in such encounters.

In contrast to views positing a one-to-one correlation between linguistic form and pragmatic function, Kidwell's analysis reveals how a wide variety of turn types are understood, within the context of front desk encounter openings, as requests for service. Moreover, she demonstrates that, in the context of front desk encounters, the action of a student walking to the counter is—without any talk whatsoever—understood by receptionists as a pre-request, request for attention

prior to making a request for service. This article reveals some specific ways that the organization of talk in an institutional setting can facilitate a limited proficiency NNS's success in talk and interaction.

Hosoda's study looks at conversational interactions in Japanese, including NS-NNS conversations as well NS-NS conversations. By focusing on other-repair, she takes a conversation analytic approach to phenomena in nonnative discourse that have already been studied in native speaker discourse in English and other languages, including Japanese. The issue here is the initiation of other-repair, or the ways in which nonnative speakers of Japanese help to occasion repair of their own talk by native speaker interlocutors. Consistent with the preference for self-initiation of repair documented in native speaker interactions, Hosoda finds that native Japanese speakers generally provide other-repair for their nonnative speaking peers only in response to practices which seem to invite repair.

Hosoda identifies a range of speaking practices (such as sound stretches and rising intonation) as well as embodied resources (such as gaze direction and body orientation) that are understood by recipients as inviting, or initiating, other-repair. Her analysis also focuses on practices for accepting other-repair, and suggests that problems of understanding may be involved when such acceptance behavior is missing. This study, by looking at other-repair in interactions involving nonnative speakers of Japanese, provides insights into the overall robustness of conversational structures as well as indications of some interesting variation.

While the first two articles look at NS-NNS talk in English and Japanese, Carroll examines NNS-NNS interaction in English among (native Japanese speaking) "novice-level" speakers, with an interest in their ability to manage the kinds of precision timing (Jefferson, 1973) found in the turn-taking practices of native speakers. The focus here is on the interactional competence of low-level nonnative speakers in an ability that is fundamental to the conduct of spoken interaction: the ability to start up a next turn at the projectable completion of another speakers' turn. Adult native speakers easily manage this kind of precision timing in their first language, but what about novice-level second language speakers? Carroll's analysis addresses this question by examining cases of next turn start-ups as well as speakers' attempts to resolve overlapping talk.

Carroll finds that novice-level speakers are capable of precisely timing next turn start ups some of the time, though inter-turn gaps are more common in this data than found in (NS) ordinary conversation. Since the data includes mainly short, simple turns constructions, Carroll leaves open the question of how these speakers would do at projecting the completion of more syntactically complex turns. In addition to examining how often novice speakers achieve precision timing, Carroll's analysis also considers cases of delayed next turn start ups that may in fact be responsive their interactional environment. Rather than resulting from a lack of competence, Carroll suggests that some inter-turn gaps are responsive to disfluencies in the prior turn that make it difficult to project the turn completion. Other delayed starts are argued to be similar to native speaker treatment of insuffi-

cient answers to questions. This kind of analysis is an example of the way a careful consideration of talk in its sequential context can avoid over-simplifying all instances of a phenomenon like inter-turn gaps as evidence of a lack of competence.

We hope that this issue of *ial* may help to further our understanding of the nature of nonnative discourse and also exemplify some powerful tools for its investigation. The articles represent conversational and institutional talk, NS-NNS and NNS-NNS interaction, talk among nonnative speakers of Japanese and English, and second as well as foreign language contexts. However, there is much more to accomplish if we are to understand nonnative discourse on its own terms, according to the social actions carried out and the orientations of the participants. There is a greater range of methodological diversity envisioned in the theme of nonnative discourse than is represented in this issue, including linguistic anthropology and the ethnography of speaking. There are also many discourse contexts not represented in these pages, including: pedagogical contexts, such as small group and tutorial interactions; and institutional and workplace contexts, such as medical encounters, and office and factory interactions. The forthcoming volume being edited by Rod Gardner and Johannes Wagner (in preparation) on international communication reflects a growing interest in this area of study and promises to make a valuable contribution. Nonnative discourse is a diverse domain of interaction in the world, and much remains to be learned. It is hoped that this issue, with its conversation analytic perspective, will contribute to a growing and diverse body of research on a wide range of nonnative speaker interaction.

NOTES

[1] When the call for papers went out, the aim was to invite researchers working from a variety of theoretical perspectives on spoken interaction, with the limitation that analysis should focus on details of recorded and transcribed discourse. While conversation analysis was intended to be an important part of the mix, the range of manuscripts submitted and the review process has resulted in an issue of conversation analytic research.

[2] Such a view is consistent with Poole's observation (Olsher, 1996) that with the growing population of limited English proficiency students in California public schools, the monolingual native speaker classroom is increasingly rare. The linguistic complexity of the situation including learners who have immigrated at various stages of school, those who have been raised in the US in an immigrant community, and those who are raised in multilingual households, makes it increasingly difficult to apply a bipolar native versus nonnative speaker distinction.

REFERENCES

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1,* 1-47.

Cook, G. (2000), *Language play, language learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Egbert, M. (1998). Miscommunication in language proficiency interviews of first-year German students: A comparison with natural conversation. In R. Young & A. He (Eds.), *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency* (pp. 147-169). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics, 26,* 237-260.

Gardener, R., & Wagner, J. (in preparation). *International communication: Studies of native and non-native interaction.*

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal, 81,* 285-300.

Gaskill, W. (1980). Correction in NS-NNS conversation. In D. Larson-Freeman (Ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language acquisition research* (pp. 125-137). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Gass, S. (1998). Apples and Oranges; Or, why apples are not oranges and don't need to be. A response to Firth and Wagner. *Modern Language Journal, 82,* 82-90.

Hall, J. K. (1993). The role of oral practices in the accomplishment of our everyday lives: The sociocultural dimension of interaction with implications for the learning of another language. *Applied Linguistics, 14,* 145-166.

Hatch, E. (1978). Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. In E. Hatch (Ed.), *Second language acquisition* (pp. 402-435). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

He, A. (1998). Answering questions in LPIs: A case study. In R. Young & A. He (Eds.), *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency* (pp. 101-117). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

He, A., & Young, R. (1998). Language proficiency interviews: A discourse approach. In R. Young & A. He (Eds.), *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency* (pp. 1-24). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.) *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-285). Harmondsworth: Penguin,.

Jacoby, S., & McNamara, T. (1999). Locating competence. *English for specific purposes, 18,* 213-241.

Jefferson, G. (1973). A case of precision timing in ordinary conversation: Overlapped tag-positioned address terms in closing sequences. *Semiotica, 9,* 47-96.

Jefferson, G. (1996). A case of transcriptional stereotyping. *Journal of Pragmatics, 26,* 159-170.

Jordan, B., & Fuller, N. (1975). On the non-fatal nature of trouble: Sense-Making and trouble-managing in *lingua franca* talk. *Semiotica, 13,* 11-32.

Kasper, G. (1997a). Beyond reference. In G. Kasper and E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 345-360). London: Longman.

Kasper, G. (1997b). *Can pragmatic competence be taught?* University of Hawaii: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.-

Kasper, G. (1997c). 'A' stands for acquisition: A response to Firth and Wagner. *Modern Language Journal, 81,* 307-312.

Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (Eds.). (1993). *Interlanguage pragmatics.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13,* 215-247.

Koshik, I. (1999). *Practices of pedagogy in ESL writing conferences: A conversation analytic study of turns and sequences that assist student revision.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of California, Los Angeles.

Kurhila, S. (in press). Correction in talk between native and non-native speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics.*

Lantolf, J. P., & Appel G. (Eds.). (1994). *Vygotskian approaches to second language research.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Long, M. (1997). Construct validity in SLA research: A response to Firth and Wagner. *Modern Language Journal, 81,* 318-323.

Long, M., & Porter, P. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly, 19,* 207-228.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mehan, H. (1985). The structure of classroom discourse. In T. van Dijk, *Handbook of discourse analysis,* (Vol. 3, pp. 119-131). London: Academic Press.

Markee, N. (1994). Toward an ethnomethodological respecification of second-language acquisition studies. In E. E. Tarone, S. M. Gass, & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), *Research methodology in second language acquisition* (pp. 89-116). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (1986). *Language socialization across cultures.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ohta, A. S. (in press). *Second language acquisition processes in the classroom: Learning Japanese.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Olsher, D. (1996). Some issues in analyzing classroom interaction: An interview with Deborah Poole. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 7,* 297-308.

Poole, D. (1992). Language socialization in the second language classroom. *Language Learning, 42,* 593-616.

Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents.* London: Longman.

Rampton, B. (1997). A sociolinguistic perspective on L2 communication strategies. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 304-322). London: Addison Wesley Longman.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation,* (Vol. 2). Edited by G. Jefferson. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schwartz, J. (1980). Error correction as an interactional resource. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language research* (pp. 138-153). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Schegloff, E. A. (2000). When 'others' initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics, 21,* 205-243.

Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Tarone, E. (2000). Still wrestling with "Context" in interlanguage theory. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 20,* 182-198.

Varonis, E., & Gass, S. (1985). Non-Native/non-native conversations: A model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics, 6,* 71-90.

Wagner, J. & Firth, A. (1997). Communication strategies at work. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 323-344). London: Longman.

Wong, J. (2000a). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/nonnative speaker English conversation. *Applied Linguistics, 21,* 274-297.

Wong, J. (2000b). The token 'yeah' in nonnative speaker English conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 33,* 39-67.

Wong, J. (in press). Repetition in conversation: A look at "first and second sayings." *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 33,* 407-424.

Wootton, A. J. (1997). *Interaction and the development of mind.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Young, R., & He, A. (Eds.). (1998). *Talking and testing: Discourse approaches to the assessment of oral proficiency.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Common Ground in Cross-Cultural Communication: Sequential and Institutional Contexts in Front Desk Service Encounters

Mardi Kidwell
University of California Santa Barbara

How do native and nonnative English-speaking participants understand one another in front desk service encounters? Specifically, what are the resources that enable them to transact their business at the desk? In this paper, I use the notion of "shared background" to show how participants at the front desk of a university-sponsored English language program rely on the sequential and institutional contexts in which their talk is produced to accomplish their service activities. In particular, I show how receptionists' orientations to the institutional requirements of students' actions in the "request slot" are evident in the design of their responses to students, especially in how they manage both the discourse and institutional relevancies that students' actions pose. Then, I show how participants' opening moves prepare the way for, and render accountable, students' service-seeking activities by constraining the kinds of actions that students can relevantly produce next. I propose that such constraints provide an important resource for participants to understand and respond to one another in institutionally relevant ways, in spite of their (at times) limited shared linguistic resources.

INTRODUCTION

A great deal of cross-cultural communication research takes as its central concern how speakers of different cultures and different language backgrounds misunderstand one another (e.g., Bailey, 1997; Erickson & Rittenberg, 1987; Gass & Varonis, 1985, 1991; Gumperz, 1977, 1978, 1982; Tyler, 1995; Ulichny, 1997). This concern centers not so much on participants' difficulties in understanding or producing words and sentences that may result from their limited linguistic proficiency in a common language, but rather on difficulties that may result from what researchers call their lack of "shared background." Shared background is a term used widely in cross-cultural, cross-linguistic studies to encompass a range of cultural and socio-pragmatic issues that may affect participants' communication: for example, their differential orientation to the cultural and institutional features of a situation (e.g., Erickson & Rittenberg, 1987; Garcia & Otheguy, 1989; Tyler, 1995) and their differential use of contextualization cues to convey pragmatic intent (e.g., Gumperz, 1982, 1992; Miller, 1996; Tyler, 1995). The following quote from a study by Gass and Varonis (1985) sums up these various issues associated with "shared background" and captures what can aptly be termed a *problem approach*

to the study of cross-cultural, cross-linguistic communication:

> ...NSs [native speakers] and NNSs [nonnative speakers] are multiply handi-
> capped in conversations with one another. Often they may not share a world
> view or cultural assumptions, one or both of which may lead to misunder-
> standing. In addition, they may not share common background...that would
> permit them to converse with shared beliefs about what Gumperz and Tannen
> (1979) call the "semantic content" of the conversation. Furthermore, they
> may have difficulty with speaking and interpreting an interlocutor's discourse
> as a result of a linguistic deficit (340).

In contrast to this *problem approach*, another tack that could be taken in the study of cross-cultural, cross-linguistic communication is what could be termed a *success approach*, in other words, an approach that has as its aim explicating the resources that *enable* participants to accomplish their communicative tasks. In this paper, I undertake such an endeavor in an examination of encounters between native and nonnative English-speaking participants at the front desk of a university-sponsored English language school. Using the notion of "shared background," I show how participants rely on the sequential and institutional contexts in which their talk is produced to accomplish their service-seeking and service-providing activities. Specifically, I first show how the sequential organization of their talk in this setting—in conjunction with their institutional orientations to how that talk should be understood—motivates them to produce and respond to one another's actions as part of a cross-culturally and cross-linguistically recognizable and projectable *course of action* (that is, a course of action recognizably and projectably initiated and sustained for the purpose of transacting business at the front desk). Then, I show how their opening moves at the front desk prepare the way for, and render accountable, their service-directed activities. Further, I argue that partici-pants' institutional alignments in front desk service encounters constrain the kinds of activities that can relevantly occur after openings. Such constraints, I propose, provide an important resource for participants to understand and respond to one another in institutionally relevant ways, in spite of their (at times) limited shared linguistic resources.

About the Data

The data examined in this paper are drawn from 8 hours of videotaped inter-actions between international English language students and the native English-speaking receptionists who assist them at the front desk of a university-sponsored English language program. Students represent a variety of language backgrounds and their proficiency in English varies from beginner to nearly fluent. The front desk is where students go to transact school business, for example to pay fees, request test registration forms, and announce their presence for appointments with staff and faculty. They also seek assistance at the front desk for a variety of prob-lems associated with their stay in the US: how to take the bus downtown, rent a

car, add or drop classes, or change "homestay" families. Videotaping occurred during the period just before and after lunch and during mid-afternoon hours, times when students were most likely to converge on the desk with all manner of business.

SEQUENTIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXTS

Students come to the front desk to take care of a diverse range of matters, and the moves that comprise students' efforts to procure assistance for these matters are similarly diverse. In this section, I examine the sequential and institutional factors that enable receptionists to see students' actions as business-directed in this setting.

The Sequential Organization of Front Desk Encounters

With regard to sequential context, work by conversation analysts on the basic mechanisms of talk-in-interaction—for example, turn taking, sequence organization, and repair (e.g., Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson 1974; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973; and Schegloff, 1990)—has done much to explicate the sequential import of participants' actions in ordinary conversation, especially with regard to how a particular action "makes expectable" a certain range of next actions, and how a particular action is understood by reference to the actions that came before it—what Heritage calls the "double contextuality" of talk (Heritage, 1984, p. 242). Front desk encounters are sequentially organized around a base adjacency pair (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974) of: (1) an action (or actions) that is treated by participants as a (first pair part) request for service; and (2) the (second pair part) provision of service. The things that participants do and say in front desk encounters take on their sense for participants via their placement in this basic sequential scheme. The following example can be analyzed for how participants "lead up to" the first and second pair parts of the request/response-to-a-request adjacency pair, and then for how they move to close the encounter upon provision of the second pair part (the arrowed turns point out the base adjacency pair; S designates the student, the service seeker in these data, and R designates the receptionist, the service provider):

Example 1 ELP 4-2
1 S: aHhaaii
2 R: Hi:
3 S: I want to talk to you=I need ((lifts up flyer hanging on counter)) zzhhh.
4   (.)
5 R: Yo::u are one of the people on that list ?
6 S: umhm=
7 R: =Okay
8 R: ((speaks in a low voice to another woman who has appeared behind the
9   counter, picks up papers, looks through them, moves back toward S))

```
10  R:    Your name?
11  S:    Min Chou
12        ( 7.0 ) ((R is looking for something))
13  R:    Oh here you are. Easy. Yours is all ( . ) in an envelope ( . ) ready to go
14        ((hands envelope to S))
15        ( . )
16  R:    [That's your transfer I-20
17  S:    [What is this?
18        ( 0.2 )
19  S:    Ahhh=I see. Thank you=
((Interaction continues))
```

In Example 1, the first pair part of the base adjacency pair, S's (the student's) request for service, is found in line 3, after a greetings exchange and a preface ("I want to talk to you") (Schegloff, 1980, 1990) that picks out R (the receptionist) to be the recipient of a disclosure of some matter. The student next produces a need statement ("I need ((lifts up flyer hanging on counter)) zzhhh") that serves as the request. The student doesn't complete the utterance with words, but rather lifts up a flyer that is hanging from the counter. That the receptionist hears and sees these actions by the student in line 3 as constituting a request is evidenced by her own actions: the receptionist asks the student questions in lines 5 and 10 ("Are you on that list?" and "Your name?") that show her to be assembling the information necessary for providing what the student has asked for. When the student has answered these questions, the receptionist hands her an "I-20" (line 13), a document students must take to the Immigration Service office in order to extend or change their visas. This action constitutes the second pair part of the base adjacency pair and is followed by the student saying, "Thank you" (line 19), which—in addition to displaying receipt and demonstrating that R's response to her request has been satisfactory—proposes a closing to the encounter (see Whalen & Zimmerman, 1987, 1990; and Zimmerman, 1992 for a discussion of related features in 911 calls).

Example 1 demonstrates the remarkably stable organization that characterizes front desk encounters generally, in spite of the various local contingencies that may influence how any one particular encounter unfolds (e.g., whether or not there is a crowd of people at the desk when a student arrives there; the student's English-language proficiency in forming a request for a particular sort of service; the receptionist's success in understanding the student's request; etc.). This organization, which presumably could represent the organization of service encounters in a variety of other settings, at least in terms of their basic adjacency pair format (e.g., hotels, banks, shops, and 911 calls; see Lamoureux, 1988; Merritt, 1977; Zimmerman, 1992), can be outlined as follows:

               1. Opening
               2. Request for Service
               3. Optional Interrogative Series

4. Provision, or not, of Service
5. Closing

The organization of front desk encounters is comprised of what can be termed "slots," sequentially-organized features of encounters that can be described as: (1) an opening, which is used to establish participants' mutual availability for a student to request service and for a receptionist to attend to the request (in Example 1, this includes S's appearance at the desk, as well as lines 1 and 2); (2) the request itself, which can be constituted through a variety of lexical, grammatical, and action-type formats (line 3); (3) an optional interrogative series through which the receptionist assembles information necessary to providing what the student has requested (lines 5-12); (4) the provision, or not, of service (lines 13-14); and (5) a closing (line 19).

While the sequentially-organized slots that constitute front desk service interactions and account for their stable organization across encounters evolve from the basic sequential format of a request/response adjacency pair, how the participants' actions in the "opening slot" specifically project a request for service as the proper next action can be understood only by reference to participants' orientations to institutional context. That is, that a request for service should properly follow participants' opening actions cannot be explained as a purely sequential matter; an examination of how openings "launch" requests for service—as opposed to other action types—must be considered in light of the institutional context in which participants make their opening moves.

Institutional Considerations

Along the lines of Wilson (1991), institutional context, apart from sequential context, must be brought to bear on how participants understand the range of actions and utterance types that occur after openings as directed to front desk business. In a discussion of the institutional relevancies involved in 911 dispatches, Wilson argues that following a caller's utterance such as "somebody jus' vandalized my=car," which neither grammatically nor lexically formulates a request, participants' orientations to one another's categorical identities of "citizen complainant" and "complaint taker" (and the activities relevantly associated with these categories), provide the basis for their orientation to such an utterance as a request for emergency service (Wilson, p. 32-34). Similarly, in the case of the data at issue in this paper, the kinds of utterances that are produced by students in the request slot take a variety of formats (and combinations of formats): there are reports, narratives (Whalen & Zimmerman, 1990), need/want statements, questions, and, especially with these data, utterances that are difficult to comprehend due to participants' limited shared linguistic resources (i.e., students' low level of English language proficiency may make their talk difficult to understand for receptionists). Some of these various utterance-types used by students in the request slot can be seen in the following set of examples:

Report + Want Statement
Example 2 ELP 5-5
1   R: Hi!
2   S: I promised this the (.) I must (.) ((waves hands toward himself))
3   meet someone. I want homestay. ((points away))
4   (1.5)
5   S: no?
6   R: W-wait just start again I'm sorry ((leans forward, mouth open))
((As the interaction continues, S re-formulates his problematic utterance and R assists him))

Request for Permission as Request for Service
Example 3 ELP 1-1
1   R: Hhaai.
2   S: Uh can I:: (.) copy this is here. (.) Copy. [One copy.
3   R: [Uhh=I think so.
4   (0.5) One copy?
((R takes papers to make copies))

Question Preface + Report of Complaint/Problem
Example 4 ELP 1-3
1   R: Hi.
2   S: Hi. I have a question. ((looking away)) .hhh Uh-uh I asked
3   yesterday Maya if I could change my core classes and then
4   she told me I would know it uh yesterday afternoon
5   but nobody te-told me [about it.
6   R: [Who::'s your core class teacher?

Narrative of Complaint/Problem
Example 5 ELP 2-5
1   S: Excus:e me ((said as she's approaching the desk; starts high pitched
2   and softly))
3   R: Yeah_ss_.
4   S: Yea- I just <u>buy</u> this card (.) ((holding up card, looks at it during
5   pause))
6   R: Okay
7   S: A few (minutes) ago (.) but
8   R: hmhm
9   S: this doesn't work. (it) ((shaking card as she holds it))
10 R: (Actua-)
11 S: I called this number (.)
12 R: hmhm
13 S: This message is: ((shrugs and smiles)) (.) hhuhh!
14 R: ((Takes card, picks up phone, begins to dial))

That receptionists see and hear students' various actions and utterance-types
in the request slot as bearing on institutional matters is ultimately evidenced by
their provision of service. However, the receptionist's provision of service is also

responsive to the specific form a student chooses from the range of things one may say or do in the request slot. Receptionists make their responses to students' actions in the request slot within the constraints of both the discourse and institutional relevancies that various formats pose (see Jefferson & Lee, 1981, for a discussion of what they call "activity contamination" upon the convergence of a troubles telling and a service encounter).[1] An examination of how receptionists manage these constraints—in other words, how these constraints shape receptionists' provisions of service—furthers our understanding of the import of institutional context for receptionists' ability to respond to students' activities as business-relevant.

In Examples 1 (from the previous section) and 2, in which the students come to the desk and employ lexical items that project that they need or want something, the sequential basis for the receptionists' provisions of service can be regarded as a lexical/syntactic matter (albeit in Example 2 a great deal of clarification work must be gotten through for the receptionist to understand what the student wants). In other words, a student's *statement* that he or she needs or wants something—the case in these two examples—at least on the basis of semantics, makes relevant the receptionist's attempt to deliver it (or account for why delivery is not possible):

Example 1 ELP 4-2
3   S: I want to talk to you=I need ((lifts up flyer hanging on counter)) zzhhh.
4   (.)
5   R: Yo::u are one of the people on that list?

Example 2 ELP 5-5
2   S: I promised this the (.) I must (.) ((waves hands toward himself))
3   meet someone. I want homestay. ((points away))
4   (1.5)
5   S: no?
6   R: W-wait just start again I'm sorry ((leans forward, mouth open))

While students in Examples 1 and 2 lexically signal that they want or need something, this is not the case in Examples 3, 4, and 5. In these examples, the lexical and turn design features of students' talk cannot explain the receptionists' provisions of service in the same way as in Examples 1 and 2, and yet the receptionists' provisions of service in these examples appear as transparent accomplishments. As such, these examples lend themselves especially well to a consideration of the institutional basis for receptionists' responses. In these examples, receptionists visibly manage the discourse relevancies posed by the variously-shaped utterances that students produce in the request slot with regard to the institutional relevancies posed by the situation. That is, receptionists in these examples can be seen attending to students' actions for the ways in which they form up "assistables"—problems, or requests for assistance—and not merely to the syntactic or lexical features of the students' utterances.

For instance, in Example 3 the receptionist not only answers the student's query, "can I:: (.) copy this here." with "Uhh=I think so.", thus attending with her answer to the syntactic features of what has been formulated as a question; she also takes the student's papers to actually make the copy for him.

Example 3 ELP 1-1
((line 1 deleted))
2   S: Uh can I:: (.) copy this here. (.) Copy. [One copy.
3   R: [Uhh=I think so.
4   (0.5) One copy?
((R takes papers to make copies))

Example 3 is of the sort that is often used to illustrate the point of "illocutionary force" (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969; see also Schegloff, 1988). The receptionist can be seen orienting to the student's utterance not simply as a request for information, nor as a request for permission (an action type with which this format is conventionally associated), but for how it implicates her in making the copies for the student. In other words, it is not enough that the receptionist answer the student's question; in this particular context, she also has to *do* something for him.

Example 4 can be similarly examined for how the receptionist's actions in this setting constitute "doing something for the student." In Example 4, the receptionist "disattends" the sequential and syntactic, turn-constructional implications of the student's actions in the sense that she does not wait for the question projected by the student with the preface "I have a question" and followed by the student's explanation of her situation. Rather, the receptionist cuts in with "Who::'s your core class teacher?" and begins an interrogative series that shows her to be assembling the information necessary for providing the student with assistance.

Example 4 ELP 1-3
2   S: Hi. I have a question. ((looking away)) .hhh Uh-uh I asked
3   yesterday Maya if I could change my core classes and then
4   she told me I would know it uh yesterday afternoon
5   but nobody te-told me [about it.
6   R: [Who::'s your core class teacher?

The receptionist begins this response not at a place of "possible completion" (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, 1974) within the student's turn (while the student is projectably nearing syntactic completion of the turn constructional unit, her non-native like intonation does not foreshadow this), nor at the completion of the projected question, but at a place where she has gleaned enough of the details from the student's report to see what the problem is and what it is she can do to assist.

In Example 5, the receptionist can be seen "going back and forth" between the discourse and institutional relevancies set up by the student's talk in the way she alternates her alignments to the student as either a narrative recipient or a service provider.

Example 5   ELP 2-5
4   S: Yea- I just <u>buy</u> this card (.) ((holding up card, looks at it during
5   pause))
6   R: Okay
7   S: A few (minutes) ago (.) but
8   R: hmhm
9   S: this doesn't work. (it) ((shaking card as she holds it))
10 R: (Actua-)
11 S: I called this number (.)
12 R: hmhm
13 S: This message is: ((shrugs and smiles)) (.) hhuhh!
14 R: ((Takes card, picks up phone, begins to dial))

In Example 5, the student produces a narrative about her phone card not working and, up to line 10, the receptionist aligns to her talk as a narrative recipient (what could be called her "discourse role" in the situation) through the use of continuers: "okay" and "hmhm." The receptionist first tries to produce an assisting response upon hearing the first part of the student's narrative as the formulation of a problem about the phone card, followed by a word search in line 9: "this doesn't work (it)" The "(Actua-)" in line 10 is arguably on the way to an offer of some sort of assistance. The student, however, continues with her narrative in line 11, causing the receptionist to cut off her attempt to assist (line 10) and re-align as a narrative recipient in line 12. The student's next turn constructional unit in line 13, "This message is: ((shrugs and smiles)) (.) hhuhh!" elicits another assisting response from the receptionist who, re-aligning to the student's talk as a service provider, picks up the phone and begins to dial for the student (line 14).

In the next example, Example 6, a slightly different case can be made for how institutional relevancies potentially override those occasioned by discourse, and, in fact, provide a context for understanding action in the absence of talk. In Example 6, a student comes to the desk, says "Excuse me", and hands a piece of paper that he has taken out of an envelope to the receptionist. The receptionist takes the paper, reads it, says "I see," and then asks a question, "Do you understand?", that launches a provision of assistance on her part:

Example 6 ELP 2-12
((S comes to the desk holding a piece of paper and an envelope)
1   S: uh (.) Excuse me.
2   (.)
3   uhh ((unfolding paper as he says "uhh," hands paper to R, who is not
4   visible on camera))
5   (1.8)
6   R: ((takes paper, reads it, nodding))
7   (1.0)
8   I see.
9   (2.0)
10 S: ((taking traveler's checks out of his wallet))

11   R: Okay. Do you understa:nd what happens?
((Interaction continues))

The point with Example 6 is that even when a student comes to the desk and doesn't say anything, her or his actions will be viewed, attended to, and inspected by the receptionist for how they make relevant an assisting response on her part. That is to say, even when a linguistic context is lacking, as in Example 6 (or in a situation in which a student's linguistic production is difficult to comprehend as in Example 2), receptionists will attend to students' actions in the request slot as business-related. As with the utterances that students produce in the request slot, examined in Examples 1–5, the bodily actions that they produce in the request slot are also seen and treated by receptionists as institutionally motivated.

Pre-Beginnings and Activity Types

A question that can be asked is, how are participants' institutional motivations in these front desk service encounters formed in the first place? The previous examples demonstrate that participants' actions at the front desk are understood first of all by reference to the front desk interaction as an institutional phenomenon in the way that participants rely on the institutional context in which their talk is produced in order to make sense of it as a social action. The argument is made here that this is the case *in spite of language and culture differences.* The front desk, and the activities that expectedly take place at this site, can be said to comprise what Stephen Levinson calls an "activity type" (Levinson, 1992), and in particular one that is constituted through participants' shared orientations to front desk conventions, orientations that derive from what Schegloff (1979) and others (see Wakin & Zimmerman, 1999; Whalen & Zimmerman, 1987; Schiffrin, 1977) term "pre-beginnings."[2]

Pre-beginnings refer to the processes by which various alignments to an encounter are constituted prior to the opening of the encounter. In the case of front desk service encounters, students are directed to the front desk by their instructors to take care of matters for which they may first try to get assistance from their instructors, or for matters that the school has asked instructors to announce in their classes. When students first arrive at the school and are given an orientation, they are told that the front desk is where they should go for assistance and to take care of various school matters. In addition, the front desk provides a physical entity that students regularly pass by en route to their classes. Not only can students see what kinds of activities transpire there, but they also have experience with similar sites for procuring assistance in a range of other settings in their own countries: such as doctors' offices, banks, and hotels. Thus, when students arrive at the front desk, receptionists understand themselves to have been selected to be recipients of actions for which they are known to provide assistance via the avenues just mentioned, and students can expect this. The front desk, and the activities that participants engage in there, comprise "common sense knowledge" (Garfinkel, 1967).[3]

That is, the activities that relevantly transpire at the front desk are activities that are known in common and constitute socially sanctioned grounds for inference and action. As such, participants are reciprocally accountable for maintaining congruent lines of action with regard to the encounter (see Garfinkel, 1967, on the "reciprocity of perspectives").

In the next section, I will examine this issue of accountability in more detail. I will show how participants, through their opening actions, clear the way, so to speak, for students to produce utterances and actions that are treated as "assistables" by receptionists and, in fact, make a service-seeking type action by a student a proper outcome of her or his appearance at the desk.

OPENINGS

Students' Appearances at the Desk

The "institutional fingerprint" (Drew & Heritage, 1992, p. 26) that front desk encounters bear is evidenced in the very first actions of participants. The action that constitutes the first possible component of an opening in front desk encounters is an appearance by a student at the front desk. This is an action that on its own provides receptionists with a resource for orienting to the student's next action as a request for service. The front desk, as just discussed, is an "activity relevant site." When someone appears there, certain inferences are made as to why that person is there, inferences that constrain what participants can relevantly do next and that set in motion a course of action directed at taking care of front desk business.

This is demonstrated in Example 7. There, the receptionist responds to the student's approach toward the desk, *prior to any verbal exchange*, as a "request" for her attention. In this example, the student approaches the counter and the receptionist leans forward and raises her eyebrows. This action shows the receptionist's readiness to attend to the student's next action before the student has in fact said anything:

Example 7 ELP 4-6
```
1   S:   ((walks up to the counter))
2   R:   ((leans closer to the counter—until this point she's out of view of the
3        camera—and raises her eyebrows))
4   S:   Uhhh Jane do you know uhh (i)f uh Pam di(d) she got my uh she got m:y
5        ( . ) I-twenty?
```

As Example 7 demonstrates, the student's merely appearing at the front desk elicits the receptionist's attention, and the receptionist's attention is clearly *for* something. That is, the student's appearance at the desk makes relevant a subsequent action by that student, and is oriented to as such by the receptionist in the way the receptionist shows herself through re-arrangements of her body position, expression, and gaze to be a ready recipient of the student's next action. Students

appearing at the desk can be compared to a summons (Schegloff, 1968), and like a summons, once a receptionist's attention has been elicited by a student's appearance, the student is expected to provide a reason to the receptionist for having come to the desk. In Example 7, the student's reason for coming to the desk turns out to be asking for information.

The point that will be made through a further examination of these data is that a student's appearance at the desk sets in motion not just any course of action, but one that is accountably business-related. A student's appearance at the desk, however, may occasion other interactional work by participants, additional components of openings which help participants to establish a place in the encounter to begin their business activities. An examination of some of these additional components shows further how participants in this setting form up their alignments to one another as service seekers and service providers.

Solicits

While students may simply appear at the desk and in so doing round up the attention of receptionists and launch directly into a service-seeking disclosure (as in Example 7), some bit of talk may—and usually does—intervene between students coming to the desk and their disclosure of an item of business. One type of talk is that produced by receptionists which not only serves to show their availability to attend to a student, but also serves to prompt the student's disclosure of business. For example, upon a receptionist's noticing a student at the desk, he may say, "yes?", "what's up?", or "do you have a question?", moves which may be termed *solicits*. Consider the following examples:

Example 8 ELP 1-7
((Student comes to the desk.))
1   R: Yes.
2   S: (Hi) (.) ha! (.) Can I take my- your I-ten form?

Example 9 ELP 2-10
((Student comes to the desk.))
1   R: Hi What's [up.
2   S: [Hi. About the:: business with the (   ) (east coast) (.)
3   I don't kno:w (.) who (.) I have to talk to.

Example 10 ELP 1A-5
((S4 has been waiting in line as R finishes transaction with S2. R tells S2 that she must go in the back to take care of her business, then R notices S4 standing at desk.))

1   R: and if anybod—((to S2))
2   Do you have a question? ((to S4))
3   S: yeah uh (.) we are in Steve's class.

Example 11 ELP 4-9
((R has just finished talking to S9; S10 has been waiting in line, R turns to S10.))
1   R: Your question
2   S4: Do you know if Toby's in today?

Receptionists' responses in the above examples show that not only do they make themselves available to attend to students when they come to the desk, but that they *elicit* students' disclosures of their reasons for coming to the desk. Receptionists' solicits can be separated into two kinds: those directed to an *unspecified* next action by the student, and those directed to a *specified* action. In Examples 8 and 9, "yes" and "what's up" are directed to an unspecified next action by the student: that is, the student should do or say *something* upon appearing at the desk that warrants his or her appearing there, but what that should be is not specified by the receptionist (although this is not to say that what the student says or does next should not be business-related, the point to be continued below). In Examples 10 and 11, however, receptionists' responses are directed to a specified action that make explicit the institutional bearing that students' next moves should have. In these examples, receptionists demonstrate an orientation to the students' next moves specifically as questions, and provide evidence of their strong orientations to the range of things that a student is not only likely to do next but *should* do next, before the student has in fact done anything except appear at the desk. These examples of solicits (Examples 8-11) demonstrate participants' in-progress alignment to an encounter: students who appear at the desk summon the attention of a receptionist who displays—or delays displaying—his or her readiness to attend to a next action by the student, thereby regulating when students can have a turn at disclosing their business; receptionists use solicits to prompt students to state their business when they are ready to attend to it, and constrain what students should do next.

Summonses
        Further evidence of how participants set in motion a course of business-directed activities with their opening moves is provided by another set of examples. When receptionists are unavailable to attend to students upon their appearance at the desk, students may seek to engage receptionists via verbal or mechanical means. Students may speak first, or ring a bell, when presenting themselves at the desk has—on its own—been ineffective in rounding up the attention of the receptionist. For example, the receptionist may have stepped away from the desk, or be engaged in other business, such as helping another student or talking to a co-worker. In these instances, students may accompany their appearances at the desk with a greeting, with a verbal summons such as "excuse me," or with a mechanical summons such as ringing a bell that resides on the counter. These methods are demonstrated in the following examples:

Example 12 ELP 1-4
((Student appears at the desk. Looks around, over desk. R is visible kneeling behind the desk.))

1   S: °Hi° ((looks over the desk))
2   R: Hiya (So Fan) . ((Points to the door behind her)) (.)
3   She's here (.) Pam! (2.0) Just a sec.

Example 13 ELP 2-5
((Student is trying to use the telephone, leaves, then comes back. No one is at desk.))

1   S: Excuse:e me ((said as she's approaching the desk; starts high pitched and
2   softly))
3   R: Yeah<u>ss</u>
4   S: yea- I just <u>buy</u> this card (.) ((holding up card, looks at it during pause))

Example 14 ELP 3-1
((Student comes to the desk, looks around, looks at the yellow slip of paper that he is holding. No one is at the counter, so he rings the bell))

1   S: ((rings bell))
2   (3.0)
3   R: He::y
4   S: Hi Jody. Good morning. Uhh can you hhelp me.

In Examples 12-14, students' appearances at the desk on their own do not elicit responses from receptionists, who are visibly preoccupied, or away from the desk. Students in these examples summon the receptionists, which as discussed above, is an action that has built into it a subsequent—though not-as-yet-produced—action (i.e., a student should do something after summoning the receptionist). Receptionists' responses to students' summonses in these cases, like receptionists' responses to students' appearances at the desk in the previously discussed examples (Examples 8-11), serve to show a receptionist's availability to attend to a student's not-as-yet-produced action, and provide the go-ahead for his or her disclosure of business. In these examples, students pursue receptionists for attention to their business matters and make the treatment of their appearance at the desk an accountable issue.

The different types of openings discussed (a student appearing at the desk and launching into a disclosure of business following a non-verbal show of recipiency by the receptionist; a student appearing at the desk and being prompted by the receptionist to disclose business; and a student appearing at the desk and summoning the receptionist who is not readily available) are shaped by differing local contingencies, and they are structurally different as well (in who speaks first and at what point). Nonetheless, they are manifestations of the same basic organization which derive from the institutional requirements of the situation that make students' coming to the desk an accountable matter.

"Deviant" Cases: The "Relevant Absence" of Business Disclosures

One final set of examples will be turned to now to make the case that certain institutionally directed actions should follow participants' opening moves in front desk encounters. When students do not provide, or delay providing, a business-directed reason for appearing at the front desk, the "relevant absence" of such a reason is noticeable in participants' actions that follow. This is evident in the next two examples in which participants take a detour from business-related matters after their opening actions and pursue social, non-business activities in the request slot. In so doing, they engage in behaviors that show their actions in the request slot to be alternatives to the kinds of actions that usually occur there.

In Example 15, the student comes to the desk and says "hi", which is in overlap with the receptionist's solicit, "what's up?" Rather than answering "what's up" with a business-directed response, however, the student repeats "hi" in a louder voice and adds "how are you?", initiating a sequence that pushes back his disclosure of business to line 9 (arrowed turns denote the alternative action, and then the canonical action):

Example 15 ELP 2-4
((S is waiting at the desk as another student finishes up. He's waiting to the side, looking down. When the other student leaves he slides over and takes his place.))
```
1    S:    [°hi::°
2    R:    [What's up.
3          (0.2)
4-> S:    Hi how are you? ((smiles))
5-> R:    Okay ((smiling)) [and you?
6-> S:                     [he-he-he
7-> S:    [(goo'(d)) ((nods head affirmatively))
8-> R:    [=thhh! ((laughing sound))
9    S:    Uh ca:n you give me the telephone for m: [y=uhh conversation partner?
```

There are two points to be made about what follows the receptionist's "what's up?" in line 2 that demonstrate how participants reorganize their actions in this encounter and orient to what becomes an exchange of social "niceties" as an alternative to business matters. First, there is the two tenths of a second gap that occurs in line 3. In one sense, the gap "belongs" to the student: The receptionist's solicit, "what's up," has opened up the request slot, making relevant here the student's disclosure of business, which the receptionist waits for in line 3. The student, however, has greeted the receptionist, and in that sense, the gap is a place for the receptionist's return greeting. Evidence that the student is oriented to the gap as such, that is, that it is a place for the receptionist to say something, is found in his louder, renewed greeting in line 4. This second greeting by the student has a reparative quality (i.e., it is a repeat in the context of his first greeting having been said in overlap with the receptionist's talk, and he produces it with a louder volume and stresses it; see Schegloff, 1987). However, with the addition of "how are

you?", the student pursues a response from the receptionist in a stronger way than if he had just reissued the greeting. In so doing, he transforms the repair of his prior greeting into a new, non-business activity, with which the receptionist can be seen aligning in line 5.

The second point to be made about how the participants are reorganizing their activities in Example 15 is that the smiling and chuckling with which they accompany the non-business trajectory of lines 4-8 render the sequence a joke of sorts, or perhaps more aptly, a "mock" how-are-you exchange. The smile with which the student accompanies his "how are you" and the smile that the reception-ist returns underscore the social posture—in contrast to a business one—that they are taking with one another. With their laughter, they show the sequence to be an out-of-context exchange of niceties that is produced within the context of the re-ceptionist having prompted the student to disclose his business, a *misplacement*, so to speak, that they make visible as such with humor.

Example 16 shows participants to be similarly responsive to the alternative action-type produced in the request slot. In this example, two students come to the desk and are greeted by the receptionist in a friendly, informal manner. S1 says "hi" in return, which the receptionist follows with "what's up?" However, her solicit is not answered. Rather, S2 proffers his own greeting to the receptionist, made relevant particularly because the receptionist greeted both men (the receptionist's "what's up?" is issued after S1 greets her, but before S2 has had a chance to greet her). The receptionist does not respond to S2's greeting. Instead, the receptionist appears to wait for a disclosure of the students' business in line 5, the request slot position that she occasioned with "what's up?" She then embarks on a "so-how's-the-baby?" (line 6) sequence that pushes back S1's disclosure of business to line 15:

Example 16 ELP 5
((Two students appear at desk, chatting to each other in Arabic.))
1   R: Hey guys!
2   S1:   Hi!
3   R: What's up?
4-> S2:   Hi Judi
5   (2.0)
6   R: So how's the baby?
7   S2:   ha-ha yes
8   R: It's ok?
9   S2:   It's ok
10   R: It's a boy or a girl.
11   S2:   No, boy
12   R: Yeah.
13   S2:   Hm-hm.
14   (0.5)
15->S1:   Yeah. (.) Uh you know I told you about my uhh (.) I-20

The receptionist's use of "so" in "so how's the baby?" in line 6 marks the utterance as a new topic. In the context of having solicited a disclosure of business from the students, and the absence of that disclosure in line 5, she detours from the business topic she had proposed and invites S2's disclosure on a social matter. While in other contexts the newsworthiness of the birth of a baby—in particular, the baby's health and sex—may occasion its discussion earlier on in an encounter (as soon as participants meet, for example, or just after greetings), in this context, it is a topic that is subordinated to business matters, and turned to by the receptionist when the students' disclosure of business is unforthcoming.

Another point to be made about Examples 15 and 16 is that while students' departures from business topics to social topics entail re-alignment work by participants, the students' return to business matters does not appear to necessitate the same kind of work. A possible answer to how this is so may be found, again, in the institutional requirements of encounters: Participants may be treating the departures as quick detours that expectedly lead back to business matters. This is not to say that there is not some work involved in leading them back, however. In Example 15, the student launches into his disclosure of business immediately following his "how-are-you" exchange with the receptionist. In contrast, in Example 16, getting back to business is undertaken via a more circuitous route. In Example 16, the receptionist does not pursue her line of inquiry about the baby after line 12, where she produces a third position receipt token, "Yeah". Then in line 14, she allows a gap to elapse following S2's "Hm-hm," after which S1 begins his disclosure of business. That S1, too, allows the gap to elapse as he waits for S2 and the receptionist to finish up their exchange is also worth noting.

While front desk encounters are sequentially and institutionally organized such that addressing students' business is the first—and usually only—topic that participants turn to, the organization is nonetheless a flexible one: topics other than business may be brought up in front desk encounters, but they are organized as "alternatives". That is, participants may propose a social rather than a business footing (Goffman, 1981) to an encounter in their first actions. However, a non-business footing is consequential for how an encounter is subsequently organized, and represents an alteration of an encounter's canonical format that may be marked as such in the ways demonstrated above.

In sum, there is a place in the routine of front desk encounters—a place in their institutional organization as occasioned by participants' sequential conduct—for a request for service to be made. Participants' opening moves prepare the way for this by constraining the kinds of actions that can relevantly occur once a student appears at the desk, predisposing participants to recognize those actions as relating to front desk business. If participants' actions do not relate to front desk business, they are likely marked as alternatives, as in Examples 15 and 16.

CONCLUSION

Participants' orientations to institutional context enable them to attend to the diverse utterances and action types that occur in the request slot as service-related, such as need/want statements, questions, reports, narratives, and—especially with these data—difficult to comprehend utterances, in addition to non-verbal actions (such as a student handing the receptionist something as in Example 6). That is, the service-related relevance of these various utterances and action types is formed up through participants' orientations to the institutional identities of service seeker and service provider, identities that are invoked and accountably oriented to when students present themselves at the front desk. These identities, and the discourse routines they are tied to, are associated with the front desk as an institutional and culturally recognizable phenomenon, an activity type that is constituted through participants' shared orientation to front desk conventions, and which derive from participants' pre-beginning activities. The institutional nature of front desk encounters, and the kinds of things that participants expect one another to say and do, predisposes participants to understand one another via the activity categories relevant to this setting.

The native/nonnative aspect of these data make especially visible the contextual, *extralinguistic* resources—specifically sequential and institutional resources—that participants employ to make sense of one another's actions, and provide evidence of the processes by which context indexes language and renders recognizable speakers' utterances within activity types, regardless of speakers' native or nonnative speaking abilities. Language, as many scholars have noted, is inherently *underspecified* (e.g., Gumperz, 1996; Sapir, 1933; Whorf, 1956). That is, no matter what anyone says, their utterances can never completely convey all of the potential or even relevant meanings about a given situation at any moment in time: There is always more that could be said. In the data presented here, students' utterances in the request slot were not only *underspecified*, but, in their nonnative-like formulations, they were frequently *misspecified* as well. As Hanks (1996) writes, it is suggested as a concluding point that,

> ... for two or more people to effectively communicate, it is not sufficient, and perhaps not even necessary, that they "share" the same grammar. What they must share, to a variable degree, is the ability to orient themselves verbally, perceptually, physically to their social world. That is, the basis of linguistic practices is not a common set of categories (whether viewed as verbal or cognitive) but rather a commensurate set of categories, plus commensurate ways of locating oneself in relation to them (235).

The organizational constraints discussed in this paper, sequential and institutional, provide an account of how requests for service by the language students in this study are understandable as requests for service, in spite of linguistic difficulties they may have had in formulating their requests. In other words, partici-

pants' linguistic difficulties did not, in the end, appear to impede students' abilities to get assistance, nor did they appear to hinder receptionists' abilities to provide assistance. In an age of "multiculturalism," such front desk routines should be considered what Gumperz calls an "international *genre*" of talk (1996, pp. 377-388), one that enables participants to "get around" the cultural and linguistic differences that are the preoccupation of a great deal of cross-cultural communication research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

NOTES

[1] Jefferson and Lee discuss how troubles telling sequences warrantably occasion a certain kind of response from recipients of a telling, namely the expression of sympathy. However, "sequential problems" can arise when a troubles telling occurs in a service encounter context (e.g., the provision of emergency services). Service encounters are subject to their own sequential constraints in the form of the kinds of responses oriented to as relevant by participants. The convergence of these two relevant organizations, that is the troubles telling and the service encounter, can result in something that Jefferson and Lee call the "cargo syndrome," a situation whereby service providers come off as "indifferent" to the troubles to which they are responding (Jefferson and Lee, 1992, p. 538).

[2] Whalen and Zimmermann (1987), in research on 911 calls, use the term *pre-beginnings* (see also Schegloff, 1979, p. 26; Schriffrin, 1977; and Wakin & Zimmerman, 1999) to refer to the institutional processes by which emergency dispatchers will recognize a 911 call to be a request for emergency assistance, *regardless* of the kinds of utterances, or lack of an utterance, that callers might produce upon reaching a 911 operator. They exemplify their point with the case of callers who hang up upon reaching a 911 operator. When a caller hangs up, the 911 monitoring system allows the operator to call back the caller and inquire as to whether or not assistance is really needed. Thus, operators treat *any* call as a "virtual" emergency by virtue of what they presuppose the caller to have done before reaching the emergency operator, which is to have dialed 9-1-1. Dialing 9-1-1 constitutes a *pre-beginning* activity by which the caller *selects* a recipient, inferrably to solicit recipient's engagement in the course of activities for which they are conventionally, or *institutionally,* associated: providing assistance for emergencies.

[3] I would like to thank Tom Wilson for his suggestions about how to incorporate an ethnomethodological perspective here.

REFERENCES

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Bailey, B. (1997). Communication of respect in interethnic service encounters. *Language in Society, 26,* 327-356.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). *Talk at work.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Erickson, F., & Rittenberg, W. (1987). Topic control and person control: A thorny problem for foreign physicians in interaction with American patients. *Discourse Processes, 10,* 4, 401-415.

Garcia, O., & Otheguy, R. (Eds.). (1989). *English across cultures: Cultures across English: A reader in cross-cultural communication.* Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gass, S. M., & Varonis, E. M. (1985). Miscommunication in native/nonnative conversation. *Language in Society, 14,* 327-343.

Gass, S. M., & Varonis, E. M. (1991). Miscommunication in nonnative speaker discourse. In N. Coupland, H. Giles & J. M. Wiemann (Eds.), *Miscommunication and problematic talk* (pp. 121-145). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gumperz, J. J. (1977). Sociocultural knowledge in conversational inference. In M. Saville-Troike (Ed.), *Twenty-Eighth Annual Roundtable monographs on languages and linguistics* (pp. 191-211). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Gumperz, J. J. (1978). The conversational analysis of interethnic communication. In E. L. Ross (Ed.), *Interethnic communication: Proceedings of the Southern Anthropological Society* (pp. 13-31). Athens: University of Georgia.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. J. (1992). Interviewing in intercultural situations. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work* (pp. 302-330). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. J. (1996). The linguistic and cultural relativity of conversational inference. In J. J. Gumperz & S. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (pp. 374-406). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. J., & Tannen, D. (1979). Individual and social differences in language use. In C. Fillmore, D. Kempler, & W. S-Y. Wang (Eds.), *Individual differences in language ability and language behavior* (pp. 305-25). New York: Academic.

Hanks, W. F. (1996). Language form and communicative practices. In J. J. Gumperz & S. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology.* Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell, Inc.

Jefferson, G., & Lee, J. (1981). The rejection of advice: Managing the problematic convergence of a "troubles-telling' and a 'service encounter.' *Journal of Pragmatics, 5,* 399-422.

Lamoureux, E. L. (1988). Rhetoric and conversation in service encounters. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 22,* 93-114.

Levinson, S. (1992). Activity types and language. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work* (pp. 66-100). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Merrit, M. (1977). On questions following questions in service encounters. *Language and Society, 5,* 315-357.

Miller, L. (1994). Japanese and American indirectness. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, 5,* 1-19.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation. *Language, 54,* 696-735.

Sapir, E. (1933). Language. In D. G. Mandelbaum (Ed.), *Edward Sapir: Culture, language, and personality. Selected essays.* Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist, 70,* 1075-1095.

Schegloff, E. A. (1979). Identification and recognition in telephone openings. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 23-78). New York: Erlbaum.

Schegloff, E. A. (1980). Preliminaries to preliminaries: "Can I ask you a question?" *Sociological Inquiry, 50,* 104-52.

Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Recycled turn beginnings: A precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organisation. In G. Button & J. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and socal organisation* (pp. 70-85). Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Schegloff, E. A. (1988). Presequences and indirection: Applying speech act theory to ordinary conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 12,* 55-62.

Schegloff, E. A. (1990). On the organization of sequences as a source of "coherence" in talk-in-interaction. In B. Dorval (Ed.), *Conversational organization and its development* (pp. 51-71). Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica, 8,* 289-327.

Schiffrin, D. (1977). Opening encounters. *American Sociological Review, 44,* 679-691.

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay on the philosophy of language.* London: Cambridge University Press.

Tyler, A. (1995). The co-construction of cross-cultural miscommunication: Conflicts in perception, negotiation, and enactment of participant roles and status. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 17,* 129-152.

Ulichny, P. (1997). The mismanagement of misunderstandings in cross-cultural interactions. *Journal of Pragmatics, 27,* 233-246.

Wakin, M., & Zimmerman, D. (1999). Reduction and specialization in emergency and directory assistance calls. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 32,* 409-437.

Whalen, M., & Zimmerman, D. (1987). Sequential and institutional contexts in calls for help. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 50,* 172-185.

Whalen, M., & Zimmerman, D. (1990). Describing trouble: Practical epistemology in citizen calls to the police. *Language in Society, 19,* 465-92.

Whorf, B. L. (1956). *Language, thought, and reality.* J. B. Carroll (Ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wilson, T. P. (1991). Social structure and the sequential organization of interaction. In D. Boden & D. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and social structure* (pp. 22-43). Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Zimmerman, D. H. (1992). The interactional organization of calls for emergency assistance. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work* (pp. 418-469). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mardi Kidwell is a Ph.D candidate in the Department of Sociology at the University of California Santa Barbara. Her research interests include native/nonnative speaker interaction, the organization of recipiency, and interactions between young children and their caregivers. In her dissertation, she is focusing on caregiver interventions in young children's conflicts, in particular how they manage their attention toward one another in intervention scenarios.

Other-Repair in Japanese Conversations Between Nonnative and Native Speakers

Yuri Hosoda
Temple University Japan

Although a preference for self-repair over other-repair has been observed in both native speaker (NS) discourse (e.g., Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977) and nonnative speaker (NNS) discourse (e.g., Firth, 1996), researchers note that other-repair still often occurs, especially in interactions with NNSs (e.g., Varonis & Gass, 1983). The present study examines conditions under which other-repair occurs and the response to other-repair in natural NS/NNS conversations in Japanese. Analysis of the data reveals the importance of interlocutors' mutual orientation to each other's verbal and non-verbal behavior in the shaping of other-repair and responses to the repair, particularly in NS/NNS conversation.

The nature and organization of repair in naturally occurring conversation was first characterized by Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks (1977). The phenomenon addressed here includes responses to a wide range of problems of speaking, listening, and understanding, including but not limited to errors or mistakes. Repair may be initiated either by the speaker of the problematic talk (self-initiated repair) or by another speaker (other-initiated repair). The repair may then be carried out by the speaker of the problematic talk (self-repair) or by the other speaker (other-repair). Using data from interactions among native speakers (NS) of English, Schegloff et al. demonstrated a preference for self-initiation and self-repair over other-initiation and other-repair. However, they also mentioned that other-repair may be more frequent in interactions among "not-yet-competent" speakers. This comment stimulated a number of studies on other-repair in interactions with nonnative speakers (NNS), which I will now discuss.

In interactions involving NNSs, other-repair may take the form of negotiation of meaning, that is "the collaborative work which speakers undertake to achieve mutual understanding" (Ellis, 1994, p. 260). In the second language acquisition (SLA) paradigm, negotiation of meaning refers to conversational practices that include changes to the structure of a conversation to adapt to problems of learners' or their interlocutors' understanding, and it deals with the clarification of communication and correction of error by means of conversational exchanges such as confirmation checks, comprehension checks, rephrasing, and the like (see Ellis, 1994; 1999; Long, 1996; Pica, 1994). The Conversation Analysis (CA) notion of repair on the other hand deals with any responses to problems in speaking, hearing, or understanding. Examples of other-repair are not always examples of negotiation of meaning, though the two categories overlap. Unlike repair, which has

been studied using the detailed analysis of naturally occuring conversational data, negotiation of meaning has been defined primarily in the context of experimental studies of language acquisition.[1] In SLA research, negotiation of meaning has been found to be essential for the success of the interaction for second language learners (Varonis & Gass, 1985) and crucial for developing certain aspects of a second language (Long, 1996). In addition, in the course of negotiating meaning, error correction by other speakers has been found to be more frequent in NS/NNS or NNS/NNS conversation than in NS/NS conversation (e.g., Varonis & Gass). However, a number of studies have shown that even in NS/NNS or NNS/NNS conversations, error correction by the other speaker and other-repair are less frequent than error correction by the speaker of the error and self-repair (e.g.. Firth. 1996; Gaskill, 1980; Ogane, 1997; Schwartz, 1980).

In the past, researchers have mainly focused on frequency of other-repair in NS/NNS interactions, but not on the conditions under which the other-repair occurs. Moreover, as Long (1996) claims, although error correction in instructed second language acquisition has been well investigated, the status of error correction in naturally occurring NS/NNS conversation, "where a metalinguistic focus is lacking and where attempts at overt error correction rarely occur, is a theoretically and practically more interesting question" (p. 444). The present study looks at the conditions under which other-repair occurs and the response to other-repair in natural NS/advanced NNS conversations in Japanese. Although the primary purpose of the present study is a preliminary examination of the nature of other-repair in NS/ NNS conversation, I will also look at some examples taken from NS/NS conversation to investigate the similarities and differences in the ways interactants provide and respond to other-repair in NS/NNS conversation as opposed to NS/NS conversation.[2] Specifically, the present study addresses the following two questions:
1. Under what conditions do interlocutors provide other-repair? and
2. How do repair recipients respond to other-repair? In other words, is there any uptake after other-repair has been provided and before interlocutors return to the 'main sequence' of the interaction?

Repair as defined here draws upon Schegloff et al. (1977) to include instances of replacement of one utterance with another, instances of supplying of words when there is no apparent error, and outright correction. Replacement refers to repetition of all or a part of the prior utterance with some change in the form of a paraphrase or reformulation. In this case, the repair recipient's utterance may or may not contain an apparent error. Even when an utterance does not contain an error, the other party may replace the utterance with another way of expressing the same thing. On the other hand, outright correction refers to explicit provision of the correct form following a repair recipient's apparent error, and is compatible with what Jefferson (1987) calls "exposed correction," an activity that isolates the correction, "making of it an interactional business in its own right; i.e., exposing it" (p. 97). This kind of repair explicitly isolates the part of the utterance that includes an error, and may contain a word or phrase that indicates that the prior

utterance contains a mistake (e.g., *iya* "no").

In this study, I will focus on self-initiated other-repair. As I will demonstrate below, if non-verbal behavior is taken into consideration, all instances of other-repair in this study were invited by behavior of the speaker of the trouble source (where "trouble source" refers to the linguistic item that is targeted by the repair). In the following analyses, a sequence that proceeds from a speaker's utterance of a trouble source to the end of the repair negotiation will be referred to as a "side sequence" (Jefferson, 1972), and interaction before and after the side sequence will be referred to as the "main sequence."

METHOD

The data analyzed for this study are based on two NS/NNS conversations and one NS/NS conversation in Japanese, involving four individuals in all. The four participants were classmates in a doctoral program in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESOL) at an American university in Tokyo. All were male college teachers of English. The two NNSs, Gary and Jeff, were Americans who were advanced speakers of Japanese. Gary had been living in Japan for 11 years and Jeff had been living in Japan for nine years. Both of them had completed courses in teaching Japanese, conducted in Japanese and offered at the university. The two NSs, Taka and Haru, speakers of the Tokyo dialect of Japanese, were advanced speakers of English. Both Taka and Haru had lived in English-speaking countries for several years and had TOEFL scores above 600. Gary was 46 years old, Jeff was 33 years old, Taka was 44 years old, and Haru was 43 years old.

All three conversations were video- and audio-recorded during a Christmas party held by a group of doctoral students in the university cafeteria on December 19, 1998. The participants were asked to converse in front of a video camera. An audiotape recorder was placed between the two interlocutors. Everyone else (approximately 15 people) was sitting at a large table in the cafeteria. In order to avoid the noise of other conversations, the participants were asked to sit at a smaller table set in a corner of the cafeteria. While recording the conversations, the researcher was talking with the other students at the large table. The conversation between Taka and Haru (NS/NS) lasted approximately 20 min; between Taka and Gary (NS/NNS), approximately 15 min; and between Haru and Jeff (NS/NNS), approximately 20 min. Transcription and translation conventions were adapted from Jefferson (Atkinson & Heritage, 1984), Maynard (1997), and Tsujimura (1996) (see Appendix for transcription conventions).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, I will examine the context of responses to other-repair in my data. Although the focal point of this study concerns other-repair sequences, before introducing instances of other-repair, I will briefly consider instances of other-

correction that are not repair but rather are responses to requests for confirmation.

Responses to Requests for Confirmation

In the data, there were five responses to requests for confirmation in total, including instances found in both the NS/NNS and NS/NS conversations. In response to a request for confirmation, one receives either an agreement (i.e., confirmation) or disagreement (i.e., correction) from his/her interlocutor. Responding to a request for confirmation which was based on an incorrect assumption is *correction*, but it is not *repair* in the sense that it does not address problems with the speaker's speaking or the recipient's hearing or understanding. According to Kamio (1994; 1997a; 1997b), information is in a person's "territory" when: (a) the information is obtained through the person's internal or external direct experience; (b) the information embodies detailed knowledge which falls into the person's professional or other expertise; or (c) the information is about persons, facts, and things close to the person, including information about the person. In these data, in examples in which requests for confirmation were followed by unmitigated correction, the corrected information was consistently within the "territory" of the listener. Some examples are shown below. In Example 1, Taka and Haru are talking about Haru's age and birthday, information that is completely in Haru's "territory."

Example 1
1. Taka: boku yonzyuuyon-desu-yo.
           I   44-POL-IP
           'I'm 44.'

2. Haru: boku:-wa mousugu   yonzyuuyon-desu- [yo]
          I-top   soon   44-POL-IP
          'I'm going to be 44 soon.'

-> 3. Taka: [ah] sou-desu-ka
                                         oh right-POL-Q
                                         'Oh, is that so.

-> 4.   zyaa [nizyuukyuu-nen]
                then 29-year
                Then, {you were born in Showa,} the 29th year.'

5. Haru: [itigatu-de]
                January-in
                'In January'

-> 6.   san [zyuu-nen.]
                30-year
                'The 30th year.'

7. Taka: [sanzyuu]nen
              30-year
              'The 30th year.'

In lines 1 and 2, Taka finds that Haru is the same age as himself. Taka then assumes that he and Haru were born in the same year, the 29th year of the Japanese Showa era (1954) and utters *zyaa nizyuukyuunen* "then {you were born in Showa} the 29th year." As in the case of "then" in English, *zyaa* in Japanese can function to request confirmation (Hudson, 1998). Moreover, according to Labov and Fanshel (1977), when a speaker makes a statement about an event that is known to the hearer but not to the speaker, regardless of intonation, the statement is heard as a request for confirmation. Thus, although Taka's utterance in lines 3 and 4 is not marked by rising intonation, because the information is completely within Haru's domain, Taka's utterance, *zyaa nizyuukyuun,* can be taken as a request for confirmation. As soon as Haru hears "the 29th year," he corrects Taka with an unmitigated *sanzyuunen* "the 30th year," spoken with falling intonation (line 6).

Example 2 is from the NS/NNS conversation, and again, the information is in the listener's domain.

Example 2
((Taka and Gary are talking about buckwheat spaghetti, which Gary ate in Seattle.))

1. Taka: tyotto   boroboro-siteru-kanzi-zyanai?
            a little ONO-being-feeling-TAG
            'It seems dry, doesn't it?'

-> 2. Gary: hh boroboro-tte-iu-no-wa   azi-wa tigau.
                 ONO-COMP-say-NR-Top taste-Top-different
               'It does not taste dry.'

-> 3. Taka: a tigau.   yappari kou ano:: soba-tuyu   tukete kou taberu?
              oh different as expected this uhmm buckwheat-soup dip this eat
              'Oh, it doesn't. You know, like, uhmm, you dip it in the buckwheat
              soup and eat it?

4.   negi-de.
           leek-Aux
           'with leeks.'

-> 5. Gary: a >iya iya iya< ano: hu hutu:-no   spaghetti style-desu-ne. u:n. sou nn
              oh no no no uhmm ordinary-Gen   -POL-IP hmm right
              'Oh, no, no, no. Uhmm, it's ordinary spaghetti style. Hmm, right,'

6.   dakedo uhn? yappari   tigau.
           but   as expected different
           'but what? It's different, you know.'

    7. Taka: tigau-nee.
                different-IP
                'It's different.'

    In the above example, because the person who had the spaghetti that is being discussed is Gary, the information was obtained through Gary's direct experience. Therefore, the information is within Gary's "territory." In lines 1 and 3, Taka makes confirmation requests and the utterances are marked with rising intonation. Gary then provides corrections concerning the spaghetti in lines 2 and 5; the corrections are unmitigated disagreements with falling intonation.

    As noted above, correction as a response to a request for confirmation was "invited" by rising intonation, uncertainty markers or by the information being centered in the addressee's domain. The other-repair in my data, to which I will now turn, showed a pattern of self-initiation which was similar to this solicitaion of correction.

Other-Repair Instances

    In the approximately 55 minutes of conversation, there were 17 examples of other-repair, of which 2 occurred in the conversation between Taka and Haru (NS/NS), 8 in the conversation between Taka and Gary (NS/NNS), and 7 in the conversation between Haru and Jeff (NS/NNS). These frequencies show that other-repair occurred much more often in the NS/NNS conversations than in the NS/NS conversation. Quantification of instances of other-repair is not the main concern of this paper,[3] and the interpretations presented in this study are the result of case by case analyses. Nevertheless, an indication of relative frequency may provide an overall impression of the negotiation involved in each of the conversations.

    In this sub-section I will first look at the discourse environments in which other-repair took place. I will then analyze the responses to other-repair.

Self-Initiation of other-repair

        Each time a speaker produces what may be taken as a problem by a hearer, and the hearer notices the problem, the hearer has a choice of repairing "the problem" or not as well as initiating repair or not.[4] In fact, it is usually the preferred choice to initiate repair rather than to actually repair. The question is then, under what circumstances do listeners choose to produce repair in spite of the dispreferred status of other-repair? A closer look at the data reveals that other-repair was consistently given in response to particular verbal and non-verbal behaviors by the speaker of the trouble source. In other words, within my data set, other-repair occurred only after a speaker exhibited verbal or non-verbal behavior that seemed to self-initiate the repair.

    The frequencies of verbal and non-verbal behavior initiating other-repair are shown in Table 1. As shown in the table, all instances of other-repair in this data set followed certain verbal and/or non-verbal behavior by the speaker.

Table 1: Frequency of Verbal and Non-verbal
Behavior Preceding Other-Repair

Initiation Types	Verbal Only	Non-Verbal Only	Verbal + Non-Verbal	Total
# of Other-Repair	0	7	10	17

The two types of speaker behavior that self-initiate other-repair, verbal behavior and non-verbal behavior, will be discussed along with examples below.

Verbal behavior initiating other-repair

Other-repair in the data often followed particular kinds of verbal behavior of the speaker of the trouble source. According to Schegloff et al. (1977), NSs often self-initiate repair by using a variety of techniques such as sound stretches, fillers, and cut-offs. They mention that although self-initiation of repair results in self-repair much more frequently than other-repair, self-initiation can also result in other-repair. As mentioned above, other-repair refers to replacement, supplying a word, and outright correction by the other speaker. A number of studies on NS/ NNS and NNS/NNS discourse report that NNSs often attempt to solicit conversational help from their interlocutors by means of word searches and requests for help (e.g., Chun, Day, Chenoweth, & Luppescu, 1982; Day, Chenoweth, Chun, & Luppescu, 1984; Gaskill, 1980; Hatch, 1978; Kasper, 1985; Klinck, 1984). Færch and Kasper (1983) named this strategy "appealing" and claim that non-native speakers use it to signal to their interlocutors that they are facing communicative difficulty.

Of the 17 instances of other-repair in the NS/NNS conversations and the NS/ NS conversation, 10 followed verbal indications of difficulty. Both NNS and NS participants in the conversations displayed difficulty by using verbal techniques such as sound stretches, fillers, cut-offs, rising intonation, the question marker *ka*, and explicit expressions of ignorance. In Example 3, Gary's difficulty is conveyed by his extensive use of fillers (e.g., *ano*, uh).

Example 3
((Gary and Taka are talking about how travelers from Asia cannot go beyond Los Angeles on Korean Airlines.))

-> 1. Gary: hai sou sou da >demo< korean air-wa-nee uhhuh   an(hh)o maa
              yes right right but   Korean air-Top-IP ((laugh)) uhm   well
              'Yes, right right. But as for Korean Airlines, uhm, well'

-> 2.   ano zone hottoni ano: mosi ano: nisi-kaigan-ni ike-ba:, hh mazu: sono
               uhm zone really uhm   if uhmm   west-coast-to go-if   at first well
               'uhm, zone really, uhm, if uhm, you go to the west coast, at first, well'

-> 3.   toko-ni ike-ba, ano: sore-kara   ano::   uh: douyatte: uh: i: sa: ikisaki-ni
            place-to go-if uhm there-from uhmm uh how   uh   destination-to
            'well, if you go there, uhmm, then, from there, how to {go to the}
            destination'

4.   iku-ka   [wakara-nai-desu-ne iwayuru]
            go-Q   understand-NEG-IP so called
            '{you} don't know how to get {your destination}, so called'

5. Taka: [aa dakara rosanzerusu-made] tonderu-kedo=
                          oh so   Los Angeles-to   flying-but
                          'Oh, so {Korean Airlines} flies to Los Angeles but,'

6. Gary: =u::::
            uh::::
            'Uh::::'

7. Taka: sok-kara   saki-ga   ike-nai-n-desyo? daikan-kou [kuu-de-wa.]
            there-from beyond-Nom go-NEG-NR-TAG Korean-Airline-by-Top
            'You can't go beyond there on Korean Airlines.'

8. Gary: [sou sou] sou
                                                             right right right
                                                             'Right right right'

9.   sou.=
            right
            'right.'

In lines 1 to 4, Gary tries to explain whether travelers from Asia can fly
beyond Los Angeles on Korean Airlines but his utterances display verbal distress
by their increasing length and the extensive use of fillers. In lines 5 and 7, Taka
reformulates Gary's lengthy comments. Hatch (1978), who looked at NS/NNS
interactions, repeatedly observed instances of such reformulation by NSs. She
argues that a native speaker may be driven to paraphrase an utterance by a NNS
because the nonnative speaker's formulation is too lengthy and confusing.

In Example 4, Jeff displays conversational difficulty by using phrases such
as *nante-iu-no* "how do you say it?," fillers, and rising intonation, which function
as self-initiation for which Haru provides the repair by completing Jeff's final
phrase.

Example 4

-> 1. Jeff: sono (?)-san-no i i-ta-no-wa (.)   ano:u (.) nante-iu-no ano::u (.) nanimo
            that (?)-TL-Gen exist-past-NR-Top well   what-say-IP well   any
            'That (?) was {with his friend's wife} has, uhmm, how do you say, uhmmm,'

-> 2.   utagai?
               doubt
               'any doubt?'

    3. Haru: un   utagai-ga-nai.
               uh-huh doubt-Nom-NEG
               'Uh-huh. There's no doubt.'

    4. Jeff: nai-to-omotte-ta.
               NEG-COMP-thinking-past
               '{I} was thinking there was no {doubt}.'

In lines 1 and 2, Jeff searches for the phrase *nanimo utagai-ga-nai* "there's no doubt" and comes up with parts of the phrase: *nanimo utagai*. As Jeff searches for the phrase, he uses the phrase *nante-iu-no* "how do you say it?" and fillers, and marks his incomplete phrase *nanimo utagai* with rising intonation. Haru then supplies the rest of the phrase, making the phrase grammatically correct (line 3).

In addition to the verbal signals for initiating repair mentioned above, the NSs sometimes used the Japanese demonstrative pronoun *are* (translated as "that") to take the place of a specific noun or noun phrase during a word search. In their article on self-repair in Japanese and English, Fox, Hayashi, and Jasperson (1996) also found this use of demonstrative pronouns in Japanese data. They argue that "the demonstrative pronoun serves as a place holder while the speaker looks for some lexically specific noun" (p. 205). In the present data, out of 5 instances of *are* used during a word search in the NS/NS conversation, 2 instances were followed by other-repair and 3 instances by self-repair. Thus, the use of a demonstrative pronoun as a place holder was followed by other-repair as well as self-repair.

Example 5
((Taka is talking about his son, who goes to an art college. He just mentioned that his father and wife are artists.))

-> 1. Taka: sono keiretu-no ano: are- [mitai.]
               that   kind-Gen uhmm that-like
               'It may be a kind of, uhm, that.'

    2. Haru: [>sokode<] ah otousan ah sou-ka. sono:
                               there   oh father   oh right-Q well
                               'There, oh, your father, oh, I see. Well,'

-> 3.   tisuzi-to-iu-ka-ne,
               heredity-COMP-say-Q-IP
               'It's something like heredity.'

4. Taka: sou-des(hh)u-nehhehh *hh demo kodomo…
         Right-POL-IP ((laugh))   but children
         'That's right. But children…'

In line 1, Taka hesitates before a word (a noun or noun phrase signaled by the genitive *no*), inserting a filler *ano:* and a demonstrative pronoun *are*. In the next turn, Haru provides the word, *tisuzi* "heredity."

In this data set, this use of the demonstrative pronoun was exclusive to native speakers. The NNSs did not use this strategy to elicit either other-repair or self-repair. While this strategy is useful for native speakers of Japanese, whose language does not "systematically provide phrase-initial grammatical material" (Fox et al., 1996, p. 206), mastering the strategy may be difficult for native speakers of English, whose language is typologically different from Japanese in that respect.

Thus, both the NSs and NNSs self-initiated other-repair using a variety of verbal resources. However, in this data, a subtle difference was found between the way the NSs and NNSs verbally self-initiate other-repair: the NSs used the demonstrative pronoun *are* to initiate other-repair, while the NNSs stayed more with the kinds of repair initiation they knew from English.

Non-verbal behavior initiating other-repair

A closer look at the non-verbal features of the interaction revealed that the other-repair within my data consistently followed certain non-verbal signals by the prior speaker. The non-verbal signals in the data included eye gaze, posture, raised eyebrows, laughter, nods, pointing to oneself, and head tilts. Among these, eye gaze was a consistent signal in all instances of other-repair; the speaker of the trouble source always focused his gaze on the recipient before the recipient provided repair. Kendon (1990), who examined direction of eye gaze in two-person conversations in English, found that participants use eye gaze to signal when they want a response from their recipients: Speakers look away as they begin an utterance, forestalling a response, and they look back at their interlocutors when they are "open" to a response (p. 64). Moreover, Goodwin and Goodwin (1986), who examined ordinary interactions among native speakers of English, describe some ways that participants in interactions use gesture to change participation patterns during a word search. The authors note that speakers usually withdraw their eye gaze from their current recipients and display a "thinking face" as they begin a word search to show that the action is self-directed; when speakers want assistance, they shift their gaze to recipients from whom they hope to receive help. Similar findings are reported by Schwartz (1980), who examined repair in interactions between non-native speakers with various language backgrounds including Japanese. Schwartz also found that non-native speakers made eye contact with addressees along with the other non-verbal strategies as a means of initiating other-repair.

In the present study, non-verbal signals for initiating repair occurred with or

without verbal signals for initiating repair. Therefore, even examples which might be treated as other-initiated repair based on the audio-tape in fact include non-verbal behavior which seems to function to initiate other-repair, as in Example 6. (Transcription conventions for non-verbal information are shown in the Appendix.) In the transcript, only non-verbal features that are relevant to the analysis are indicated. Non-verbal features of the speaker and the addressee are shown below each utterance.

Prior to Example 6, Taka has started talking about the *enzyokin* "financial aid" that a certain community receives from the government.

Example 6

- > 1. Gary: |enzyou-kin.
           flaming-money
           'Flaming money.*'
           |— — — — — — —
      Gary: |((leaning forward and looking closer at Taka))

- > 2. Taka: enzyokin.
           financial aid
           'Financial aid.'

   3. Gary: ah enzyokin en en=
           oh financial aid
           'Oh, financial aid, fi, fi,'

   4. Taka: =enzyokin.
           financial aid
           'Financial aid.'

In line 1, Gary displays that he had some difficulty catching the word *enzyokin* "financial aid"; he repeats the word incorrectly and it becomes a trouble source. Gary initially uttered the word *enzyoukin* with falling intonation and with no verbal signals of repair initiation. However, during this utterance, he leans forward and looks closely at Taka. In line 2, Taka provides the correct word.

Even when there were indications of verbal distress such as fillers, if nonverbal indicators did not accompany them, the hearer did not provide repair, as shown in Example 7.

Example 7
((Jeff and Haru are talking about the relationship between two people in a scenario on a Discourse Completion Test they took in a Pragmatics course the previous semester.))

   1. Jeff: demo native speaker-toshite=
           But   native speaker-as
           'But as native speakers,'

2. Haru: =hai.
            Yes
            'Yes.'

- > 3. Jeff: |ano:::u goku syousuu-ka |ano:u |hhuh
               uhmm very few-only uhmm ((laugh))
               'Uhmm, very small number of people, uhm ((laugh))'
               |— — — — — — — — — — |— — —|— —
        Jeff: |((looking down)) |((looking up and smiling at Haru))
        Jeff: |((nods twice))

4. Haru: daitaino hito-wa
           most   people-Top
           'Most people,'

5. Jeff: hai.
           Yes   .
           'Yes.'

6. Haru: yappari   nanka   kou tokubetuna kankei-da-to
           as expected somehow well special   relationship-Aux-COMP
           'After all, {the two} have something like a special relationship'

7.   omotyau-wake-da.
           think-case-Aux
           '{they} think.'

8. Jeff: sou.
           right
           'Right.'

Immediately before this segment Jeff told Haru that he did not think that the two people in the story had an affair. In line 1, Jeff starts the line with *demo* "but" which indicates a contrast. Therefore, it may not be difficult for Haru to predict what Jeff is trying to say from the context—that Jeff did not think the two had an affair, but most native speakers (of English) did. In line 3, while producing a long filler *ano:::u* and *goku shousuu-ka* "very small number only," Jeff is looking down, displaying a "thinking face." While Jeff is averting his gaze, Haru "withholds" repair in spite of Jeff's display of conversational difficulty. However, toward the end of his turn, Jeff looks up at Haru, smiles, produces the filler *ano:u* again, laughs, and nods twice. Then in lines 4, 6, and 7, Haru articulates what Jeff has been trying to say in lines 1 and 3. Regarding this point, Goodwin and Goodwin (1986) state that while a speaker is withdrawing gaze from a recipient and showing a "thinking face" in an attempt to search for a word, it may not be appropriate to intrude into the search; but when the speaker's gaze returns to the recipient, the recipient's active coparticipation in the search is "not only appropriate, but sought

by the speaker" (p. 71).

When such non-verbal signals were not followed by repair by the interlocutor in my data, the speakers intensified the signals as shown in Example 8.

Example 8
  1. Jeff: sou nazeka minna   souiu kankei-o-suru=
          right somehow everybody such relationship-Acc-do
          'Right. Somehow, everybody {speculates that they're} having an affair.'

  2. Haru: =a::=
          Oh
          'Oh'

- > 3. Jeff: =ano l::: (.) nan-desu-ka ano:::   lsui suitei?=
          uhmmm what-POL-Q uhmm estimation
          'Uhmmm, how do you say, uhmm, est, estimation?'
             l— — — — — — — — — — — — l— — —
    Jeff: l((turns his face away))   l((looks at Haru and raises eyebrows))

  4. Haru: =u:[n]
          uh-huh
          'Uh-huh.'

- > 5. Jeff: l[su]isoku?=
                speculation
                'Speculation?'
             l— — — —
             l((looks at Haru, raises eyebrows, and leans forward))

  6. Haru: =suisoku-suru.=
          speculation-do
          '{They} speculate.'

  7. Jeff: =°suisoku-da°
          speculation-Aux
          '{There's} speculation.'

At the beginning of line 3, Jeff shifts his gaze from Haru as he hesitates; toward the end of the turn, he returns his gaze to Haru, raises his eyebrows, and says *suitei* with rising intonation. Although using *suitei* is not correct and *suisoku* should be used in this context, Haru lets the opportunity to provide repair pass (line 4). Jeff then carries out what Schegloff (1997) calls "third turn repair." According to Schegloff, third turn repair refers to self-repair in the third position following a listener's contribution which neither points out nor repairs the trouble source in the first position. Schegloff argues that third turn repair has something to do with the speaker's intention to get things right. In the example above, Jeff

seems to be concentrating on getting things right linguistically, while Haru seems to be focusing on meaning. Jeff's attempt at self-repair (in line 5) can also be taken as triggering Haru's repair. In uttering *suisoku* "speculation," Jeff focuses his gaze on Haru, raises his eyebrows, leans forward and uses rising intonation. In line 6, Haru provides the repair, *suisoku-suru* "speculate."

However, listeners may not respond to the speaker's verbal and non-verbal signals right away if some other activity is going on. Consider Example 3 (repeated here as Example 9), focusing on the non-verbal features of the interlocutors.

Example 9
((Gary and Taka are talking about how travelers from Asia cannot go beyond Los Angeles on Korean Airlines.))

1. Gary: hai sou sou da >demo< korean air-wa-nee uhhuh an(hh)o maa
   yes right right but Korean air-Top-IP ((laugh)) uhm well
   'Yes, right right. But as for Korean Airlines, uhm, well'

- > 2.   almo zone hottolni ano: mosi alno: Inisi-kaigan-ni ike-ba:, hh mazu: sono
   uhm zone really uhm if uhmm west-coast-to go-if at first well
   'uhm, zone really, uhm, if uhm, you go to the west coast, at first, well'

   |— — — — — — |— — — — — — — — — — — —
   Gary: I((turns face away)) I((looks at Taka))
   |— — — — — — — — — |— — — — — — — — — — — —
   Taka: I((glances at beer and   I((looks at Gary, holding his beer))
          takes it up while
          looking at Gary))

-> 3.   Itoko-ni ike-ba, ano: sore-kara Ia Ino:: uh: Idouyatte: uh: i: Isa: ikisaki-ni
   place-to go-if uhm there-from uhmm uh how uh destination-to
   'well, if you go there, uhmm, then, from there, how to {go to the} destination'

   |— — — — — — — — — — — — |— — — — |— — — — — — — —
   Gary: I((looks at Taka))   I((turns his I((looks at Taka))
                                    head to the
                                    left twice))

   |— — — — — — — — — — — — |— — — — — — — — — —|— — — —
   Taka: I((looks at Gary, holding   I((brings his beer up to   I((looks at
          his beer))   his mouth,drinks it and   Gary))
                                        puts it back on the table
                                        while looking at Gary))

4.   Iiku-ka [wakara-nai-desu-ne iwayuru]
    go-Q understand-NEG-IP so called
    '{you} don't know how to get {your destination}, so called'
    ⌐— — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —
Gary: I((looks at Taka))
Taka: I((looks at Gary))

5. Taka: [aa dakara rosanzerusu-made] tonderu-kedo=
       oh so Los Angeles-to flying-but
       'Oh, so {Korean Airlines} flies to Los Angeles but,'

6. Gary: =u::::
     uh::::
     'Uh::::'

7. Taka: sok-kara saki-ga ike-nai-n-desyo? daikan-ko [kuu-de-wa.]
     there-from beyond-Nom go-NEG-NR-TAG Korean-airline-by-Top
     'You can't go beyond there on Korean Airlines.'

8. Gary: [sou sou] sou
                  right right right
                  'Right right right'

9.   sou.=
    right
    'right.'

10. Taka: =demo Betty-wa...
     but Betty-Top
     'But Betty...'

In lines 2 and 3, besides listening to Gary, Taka is engaged in another activity, getting his beer and drinking it. After Gary's hesitation *an(hh)o maa ano* (lines 1 and 2), Taka glances at his beer and takes it up (line 2) and from there on, he continues to hold his beer while gazing at Gary. After Gary hesitates and turns his head slightly to the left twice, Taka brings his beer up to his mouth, drinks it while Gary utters *douyatte: uh: i: sa:,* and then puts it back on the table (line 3). When Taka finishes drinking his beer and puts it back on the table, he immediately provides other-repair (lines 5 and 7).

In sum, in the present data, the production of other-repair was not arbitrary, but rather a response to a variety of verbal and non-verbal signals; listeners attended to these signals for self-initiating repair and responded to them with repair. This finding from natural conversations in Japanese corresponds with those of Schegloff et al. (1977) from ordinary conversation in English in that the occurrence of other-repair is highly constrained (i.e., just after an invitation for other-repair by the speaker of the trouble source). Interestingly, even between NS and

NNS, other-repair was restricted to certain specifiable interactional contexts: only after verbal and non-verbal invitation by the speaker of the trouble source. Because NNSs are less competent in the language than NSs, it might be expected that NSs would correct them in other interactional contexts (as is the case in language classrooms). However, if the dimensions of eye gaze and engagement discussed by Goodwin and Goodwin (1986) are taken into account, the occurrence of other-repair by the NSs in the NS/NNS conversations in my data was consistently associated with NNS self-initiation of other-repair.

Responses to other-repair

In the previous section, it was shown that other-repair in the data was consistently produced in response to particular verbal and non-verbal behaviors by the speaker to self-initiate repair. An additional aspect of the other-repair sequences is the response to the other-repair. Therefore, in this section, I will look at the discourse environment after the repair and turns immediately preceding the interlocutors' return to the main sequential action.

In the data, after other-repair was provided, it was commonly followed by verbal or non-verbal signs of acceptance by the repair recipients. Repair recipients displayed their acceptance of the repair in the form of repetition of the repaired item, tokens such as *sou sou* (right right), and/or nods. The frequency of repair recipients' acceptance behaviors is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Frequency of Acceptance Behavior

Acceptance	NS/NS	NS/NNS	Total
Total number of repair	2	15	17
Repetition	0	12	12
Tokens of *sous* or nods	2	14	16
No acceptance behavior	0	1	1

As Table 2 shows, in the NS/NS conversation, signs of acceptance followed the repair in both instances. Among the acceptance signals, repetition of the repaired item was not observed in either case, while tokens such as *sou sou* or nods occurred in both instances. In the NS/NNS conversations, other-repair resulted in acceptance in all but one instance. Of 15 instances of other-repair, 12 resulted in repetition and 14 resulted in acceptance tokens such as *sou sou* or nods. The repair recipients' acceptance behavior is discussed below.

Previous research on other-repair in NNS conversations often reports repair recipients' repetition of repaired items (e.g., Klinck, 1984). Consistent with those findings, in the NS/NNS conversations in this study, the repair recipients' agreement or acceptance of the other-repair regularly occurred in the form of repetition. Consider Examples 10 and 11 below.

Example 10
((Taka and Gary are talking about the Hutterite community.))

    1. Gary: lenzyou-kin.
                 flaming-money
                 'Flaming money.*'
                 |— — — — — — —
        Gary: l((leaning forward and looking closer at Taka))

    2. Taka: enzyokin.
                 financial aid
                 'Financial aid.'

- > 3. Gary: ah enzyokin en en=
                 oh financial aid
                 'Oh, financial aid, fi, fi,'

    4. Taka: =enzyo[kin.]
                 financial aid
                 'Financial aid.'

- > 5. Gary: [*hh] ah enzyo hai [wakari-masu.]
                              oh aid   yes understand-POL
                              'Oh, aid, yes, I understand.'

    6. Taka: [enzyokin] okane-ne?
                                        financial aid money-IP
                                        'Financial aid. Money, right?'

    7. Gary: hai hai.
                 yes yes
                 'Yes, yes.'

Example 11
1. Jeff: =ano I::: (.) nan-desu-ka ano::: Isui suitei?=
            uhmmm what-POL-Q uhmm estimation
            'Uhmmm, how do you say, uhmm, est, estimation?'
                 |— — — — — — — — — —|— — — — —
    Jeff: I((turns his face away))   I((looks at Haru and raises eyebrows))

2. Haru: =u: [n]
            uh-huh
            'Uh-huh.'

3. Jeff: I[su]isoku?=
            speculation
            'Speculation?'
                 |— — — —
    Jeff: I((looks at Haru, raises eyebrows, and leans forward))

4. Haru: =suisoku-suru.=
            speculation-do
            '{They} speculate.'

5. Jeff: =°suisoku-da°
            speculation-Aux
            '{There's} speculation.'

In Example 10, Gary repeats the word *enzyokin;*[5] in Example 11, Jeff repeats *suisoku*. In other words, the speakers used repetition in accepting the other-repair.[6]

While acceptance in the form of repetition was prevalent in the NS/NNS data, in the NS/NS data, other-repair did not result in repetition,[7] but in both instances resulted in production of acceptance tokens and/or nods, which I will address below.

Participants in both the NS/NNS and NS/NS data displayed signs of acceptance by producing tokens such as *hai hai, sou sou,* and/or nodding immediately before they returned to the main sequence of the conversation. Day et al. (1984), examining NS/NNS conversations in English, found a similar pattern. They note that interlocutors returned to the main sequence of conversation when they achieved mutual satisfaction or recognition of a repair. Consider Example 3, repeated as Example 12 below.

Example 12
((Gary and Taka are talking about how travelers from Asia cannot go beyond Los Angeles
on Korean Airlines.))

1. Gary: hai sou sou da >demo< korean air-wa-nee uhhuh   an(hh)o maa
            yes right right but   Korean air-Top-IP ((laugh)) uhm   well
            'Yes, right right. But as for Korean Airlines, uhm, well'

2.   ano zone hottoni ano: mosi ano: nisi-kaigan-ni ike-ba:, hh mazu: sono
            uhm zone really uhm if   uhmm west-coast-to go-if   at first well
            'uhm, zone really. uhm, if uhm, you go to the west coast. at first. well'

3.   toko-ni ike-ba, ano: sore-kara ano:: uh: douyatte: uh: i: sa: ikisaki-ni
            place-to go-if uhm there-from uhmm uh how   uh   destination-to
            'well, if you go there, uhmm, then, from there, how to {go to the} destina-
            tion'

4.   iku-ka [wakara-nai-desu-ne iwayuru]
            go-Q understand-NEG-IP so called
            '{you} don't know how to get {your destination}, so called'

5. Taka: [aa dakara rosanzerusu-made] tonderu-kedo=
                    oh so   Los Angeles-to   flying-but
                    'Oh, so {Korean Airlines} flies to Los Angeles but,'

6. Gary: =u::::
            uh::::
            'Uh::::'

7. Taka: sok-kara saki-ga   ike-nai-n-desyo? daikan-kou [kuu-de-wa.]
            there-from beyond-Nom go-NEG-NR-TAG Korean-airline-by-Top
            'You can't go beyond there on Korean Airlines.'

-> 8. Gary: [sou sou] sou
                                               right right right
                                               'Right right right'

9.   sou.=
            right
            'right.'

10. Taka: =demo Betty-wa...
            but Betty-Top
            'But Betty...'

In this example, as discussed earlier, an utterance by Gary is repaired by

Taka (lines 5 and 7). After Taka produces the repair, Gary displays his agreement by uttering *sou sou sou sou* (lines 8 and 9). Then, in line 10, Taka returns to the main sequential action and starts talking about their friend, Betty.

This display of acceptance in the forms of *sou*s or nods is not limited to NNSs. NSs also signaled their acceptance of repair, as seen in Example 13 below. Prior to this segment, Haru and Taka were talking about where a particular college is located. In this segment, Haru attempts to explain what kind of college the college is; specifically, he wants to say that the standard of acceptance for universities in Britain has changed so that now technical colleges are treated as universities. However, Haru fails to come up with the phrase *tekunikaru karezzi* (technical college). and Taka supplies him with the phrase.

Example 13
((Haru is talking about a sister school of the college he works at.))

1. Haru: saikin nan-nenkan-ka mae-ni   Iano:: (.) daigaku-Ino
         recently some-years-Q before-Dat uhmm   university-Gen
         'Recently, a few years ago, universities'
                                         |— — — — — — — |—
   Haru: I((looks down))   I((looks at Taka))

2.   Iare-o [(kae-ta)]
         that-Acc change-past
         'that of {universities} were changed.'
         |— — — — — — —
   Haru: I((looks at Taka and circles his right hands))

3. Taka: [tekunikaru]-karezzi-ga [daigaku-tosite]
              technical-college-Nom university-as
              'Technical colleges were {accepted} as universities.'

-> 4. Haru: [>sou sou sou   sou] sou sou<
                                        right right right right right right
                                        'Right right right right right right.'

-> 5.   Isouiu-to Iko-desu.
           such-place-POL
           'It's that kind of college.'
           |— |— — —
   Haru: I(nods)   I((nods three times))

6. Taka: ano-hen   ii-desu-yo-ne boku ano-hen suki-nan-desu-yo.
         there-around good-POL-IP-IP I   there-around like-NR-POL-IP
         'It's nice around there. I like it around there.'

In lines 1 and 2, Haru inserts a filler, pauses, uses a demonstrative pronoun

are to replace a noun phrase (i.e., the standard of acceptance for universities), circles his right hand, and looks at Taka. These verbal and non-verbal indications of difficulty elicit Taka's repair in line 3. As soon as Haru hears Taka's repair *tekunikaru-karezzi-ga*, he displays his agreement by uttering six rapid *sous* (line 4) and by nodding (line 5). Taka then returns to the main sequential action: He starts talking about the place the school is located.

Absence of acceptance
　While other-repair in the NS/NS conversation was followed by displays of acceptance, in the NS/NNS conversation, there was one instance in which the repair recipient's acceptance behavior was absent. In this instance (shown in Example 14), the further repair work provided interactional evidence that there was not yet full understanding following the repair. Prior to this segment, Taka has asked Gary if it is possible to go to Dallas on Korean airlines, and if it is, on what route.

Example 14

1.　Gary:　da dakedo: rosu-kara un sono: hutatume. |(.) mittu-no::(.) |uh:: huta|tu sono
　　　　　　but　Los-from yeah well　　second　　third-Gen　　uh　second well
　　　　　　'But, but from Los Angeles, uhm, well, the second {stop.} The third, uhm, the second, well,

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　|— — — — — |— — — — —
　　Gary:　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　|((looks up in　|((looks at Taka))
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　the air))
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　|—　　　　　|-
　　Taka:　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　|((nods twice)) |((nods))

2.　Gary:　|atono tokubetu-to　[°(tomonatteru)°]
　　　　　　other special-with　accompany
　　　　　　'the other special, ac, accompany,'
　　　　　　|— — — — — — — — — — — — — — —
　　Gary:　|((looks at Taka))

3.　Taka:　　　　　　　　　　[soko-wa　] teikeisiteiru amerika-no
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　there-Top　　tying up　America-Gen
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　'American airline companies that are tying up with
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　{Korean Airlines}'

4.　　　　　hikouki-gaisha-ni　notte-°i [ku]°
　　　　　　airplane-company-by get on-go
　　　　　　'You go there by using'

- > 5.　Gary:　　　　　　　　　　[a] amerika-no　kuru hikouki-wa,
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　America-Gen come airplane-Top
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　'Airlines coming from the U.S.,'

- > 6.   °amerika-no hikouki° amerika ei-ei-wa, toukyou-kara dallas tokubetu-no
              America-Gen airplane America AA-Top Tokyo-from Dallas special-Gen
              'American airplanes, American, A. A., from Tokyo to Dallas, it has a spe-
              cial,'

- > 7.   a[no::::]
              well
              'uhmm,'

    8. Taka: [iya dakedo]
              no but
              'No but,'

    9.   (2.0)
              |——
      Taka: |((raises his left hand to signal 'stop'))

  10. Taka: daikan-koukuu-ni   not-te:,
              Korean-airlines-in get on-and
              'You take Korean Airlines and,'

  11. Gary: hai
              yes.
              'Yes.'

  12. Taka: rosanzerusu iku-desyo?
              Los Angeles go-TAG
              'go to Los Angeles, right?'

  13. Gary: un.
              uh-huh
              'Uh-huh.'

In lines 1 and 2, Gary answers Taka's question, but after he displays verbal indications of distress and a non-verbal appeal for participation, Taka reformulates Gary's statement in lines 3 and 4. However, in lines 5-7, Gary neither repeats nor produces acceptance tokens but moves the interaction in a somewhat different direction, talking about how to fly to Japan on American Airlines, instead of how to get to the U.S. on Korean airlines. Then, after Gary's utterance in lines 5-7 and Taka's overlapped short utterance in line 8, Taka signals Gary to stop talking and attempts to get things straight (line 9). In fact, after line 13 in this segment, further misunderstanding occurred, and it took 10 more turns before they reached mutual understanding (a part of the interaction is shown in Example 3). The examples above provide evidence that when a sign of acceptance by a repair recipient is absent, there may be some problem with recognition or comprehension of the repair.

In sum, after other-repair had been provided, verbal and non-verbal signals of acceptance usually followed before the interlocutors returned to the main sequential action. Thus, other-repair may have been a sequence-initiating action that made the repair recipient's acceptance behavior in the next slot relevant. In one exception in NS/NNS conversation, a repair recipient's lack of acknowledgment seemed to correspond to a lack of recognition or comprehension of the repair.

CONCLUSION

This paper has provided an initial analysis of the conditions under which other-repair occurs and of responses to other-repair in NS/NNS and NS/NS Japanese conversations.

First, it was shown that the occurrence of other-repair in the Japanese data follow the findings from ordinary conversation in English (e.g., Schegloff et al., 1977) in that it tends to follow the preference for self-initiation, and this even holds true in native speaker correction of nonnative speaker interlocutors within peer NS/NNS talk. Because NNSs are less proficient in the language than NSs, it might be expected that NSs would support their interlocutors with occasional unsolicited corrections as do teachers in educational settings; however, this did not occur. Second, the self-initiation here was found not to be limited to the stream of speech, but also included embodied cues for soliciting help with a word search through gaze and body orientation. Third, the speakers' practice of upgrading signals that called for help to enlist other-repair was also notable in the data. Fourth, the NSs' practice of initiating repair by the use of the demonstrative *are* was present in the NS talk, but it was not used by the NNSs. Finally, analysis indicates that other-repair made relevant the repair recipients' display of acceptance in the subsequent turns. In the NS/NNS conversation, when the repair recipient did not signal acceptance, this appears to have indicated a lack of recognition or comprehension of the work being performed by the other-repair.

A number of studies of NS/NS conversation have demonstrated how participants in face-to-face interaction attend to and respond to each other's verbal and non-verbal signals in real time (e.g., Erickson & Shultz, 1982; Goodwin, 1981; Goodwin, 1987; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986). This study compared NS/NS and NS/NNS conversations in Japanese and showed that in NS/NNS conversations, even closer attention to verbal and non-verbal signals may be necessary. As NNSs more often request conversational assistance through the use of verbal indicators of distress and non-verbal appeals for participation and may have problems recognizing and comprehending repair given by NSs, NSs need to pay close attention to what their NNS interlocutors are doing, and vice versa. In face-to-face interactions, particularly in NS/NNS conversation, interlocutors' mutual orientation to each other's verbal and non-verbal behavior shapes other-repair sequences.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

APPENDIX

Transcription Conventions for the Analysis of Conversation

Abbreviations used in Interlinear Gross

IP	Interactional particle (e.g., ne, sa, no, yo, na)
Nom	Nominative (-ga)
Acc	Accusative (-o)
Gen	Genitive (-no)
Top	Topic marker (-wa)
PT	other particles
COMP	Complimentizer (-to, -tte)
Q	Question marker (ka and its variants)
POL	Politeness marker (desu, masu)
Aux	Auxiliary (be-verb)
NR	Nominalizer (e.g., no, n)
TAG	Tag question like auxiliary verb forms (e.g., desyo, zyanai, daroo, zyan)
TL	Title
ONO	Onomatopoetic expressions
PASS	Passive
NEG	for marking negation
CAU	Causative

Transcription Conventions

[ ]	overlapping talk
=	latched utterances
1.	timed pause (in seconds)
(.)	a short pause
co:lon	extension of the sound or syllable
co::lon	a more prolonged stretch
.	fall in intonation (final)
,	continuing intonation (non-final)
?	rising intonation (final)
CAPITAL	emphasis
° °	passage of talk that is quieter than surrounding talk
< >	passage of talk that is slower than surrounding talk
> <	passage of talk that is faster than surrounding talk.
hh	audible aspirations
*hh	audible inhalations
ha)	laughter within a word
(( ))	comment by the transcriber
( )	problematic hearing that the transcriber is not certain about

   ‘   ‘   Idiomatic translation of Japanese utterances

In idiomatic translation,
{   }   words or phrases which are not explicitly stated in the Japanese versions.

In transcribing non-verbal features,
| | overlapping of non-verbal behavior
- - - -   continuation of the non-verbal feature
Non-verbal features of interlocutors are shown in lines below each sentence.

Romanization
*Official romanization system according to *Monbusyoo* (Japanese Ministry of Education) is used in transcribing data.

NOTES

[1] According to Wong (2000), the essential difference between negotiation of meaning and the CA notion of repair is that while the former is limited to correction of error or to clarification of communication due to the learner's linguistic errors, the CA notion of a repair sequence deals with any problems in speaking, hearing, or understanding of the talk, including problems in redundancy, reduction through noise, lack of understanding of idiomatic use of language, and lack of ability to make inferences.

[2] Schegloff (2000) argues that in order to understand how NNSs make their way in interaction, one needs to start with examination of what is generally the case with talk and other conduct in NS/NS interaction. In this respect, this study, although preliminary, by comparing NS/NNS conversations with NS/NS conversation, may reveal something about what special forms or practices NS/NNS conversations take in other-repair sequences.

[3] Regarding quantification of occurrences of repair, Schegloff (1993) claims that each repair form is unique and has a different discourse environment, and it is important to remember that "relevance is at least as important as incidence in establishing an oriented-to-order" (p. 110).

[4] In some cases, the reason listeners do not carry out repair may be because they do not 'notice' the problem. However, as Firth (1996) mentions, it is often difficult for analysts to find out whether the listener did not notice the problem or noticed but chose to let it pass.

[5] In line 3, before he repeats the correct word *enzyokin,* Gary also utters *ah.* This *ah* may have a function similar to "oh" in English. Heritage (1984), who examined ordinary conversations in English, found that "oh," "a change-of-state token," is "closely associated with the acceptance of the counterinforming as a correction" (p. 312). In line 3, the *ah* may indicate Gary's acceptance of Taka's repair as a correction; the expected repetition of the repaired item then follows.

[6] The fact that the NNSs in the NS/NNS conversations elicited lexical repairs through word searches much more frequently than the NSs in the NS/NS conversation, and the fact that they invariably repeated the repaired items, may have implications for second language acquisition. Other-repair may create environments in which NNSs can use repetition to incorporate the corrected items into their lexicon while accepting the other-repair.

[7] However, in the NS/NS conversation, there was one instance in which repetition followed the response to a request for confirmation. This instance is shown in Example 1. In fact, all four instances of the response to requests for confimation in the NS/NNS data also resulted in repetition.

REFERENCES

Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversational analysis.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Chun, A., Day, R., Chenoweth, N., & Luppescu, S. (1982). Errors, interaction, and correction: A study of native-nonnative conversations. *TESOL Quarterly, 16,* 537-547.

Day, R., Chenoweth, N., Chun, A., & Luppescu, S. (1984). Corrective feedback in native-nonnative discourse. *Language Learning, 34,* (2), 19-45.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1999). Theoretical perspectives on interaction and language learning. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Learning second language through interaction* (pp. 3-31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Erickson, F., & Shultz, J. (1982). *The counselor as gatekeeper: Social interaction in interviews.* New York: Academic Press.

Faerch, C. & Kasper, G. (1983). Plans and strategies in foreign language communication. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 20-60). London: Longman.

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics, 26,* 237-259.

Fox, R., Hayashi, M. & Jasperson, R. (1996). Resources and repair. In E. Ochs, E. Schegloff, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 185-237). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gaskill, W. (1980). Correction in native speaker-nonnative speaker conversation. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language research* (pp. 125-137). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational organization.* New York: Academic Press.

Goodwin, C. (1987). Forgetfulness as an interactive resource. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 50,* (2), 115-131.

Goodwin, C., & Goodwin, M. H. (1986). Gesture and coparticipation in the activity of searching for a word. *Semiotica, 62,* 1/2, 51-75.

Hatch, E. (1978). Discourse analysis and second language acquisition. In E. Hatch (Ed.), *Second language acquisition: A book of readings.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In M. J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structure of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299-345). Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Hudson, M. E. (1998). So? (On Japanese connectives *sorede, dakara,* and *ja*). In N. Akatsuka, H. Hoji, S. Iwasaki, S. Sohn, & S. Strauss (Eds.), Japanese/Korean Linguistics (Vol. 7) (pp. 59-75). Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Jefferson, G. (1972). Side sequences. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 294-338). New York: Free Press.

Jefferson, G. (1987). On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organization* (pp. 86-100). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Kamio, A. (1994). The theory of territory of information: The case of Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 21,* 67-100.

Kamio, A. (1997a). Evidentiality and some discourse characteristics in Japanese. In A. Kamio (Ed.), *Directions in functional linguistics* (pp. 145-171). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kamio, A. (1997b). *Territory of information.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kasper, G. (1985). Repair in foreign language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7,* 200-215.

Kendon, A. (1990). *Conducting interaction: Patterns of behavior in focused encounters.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Klinck, P. (1984). The ecological validity of error analysis and peer correction. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 41,* 413-420.

Labov, W., & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic discourse: Psychotherapy as conversation.* New York: Academic Press.

Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of language acquisition* (Vol. 2) (pp. 413-468). New York: Academic Press.

Maynard, S. (1997). *Japanese conversation.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Ogane, E. (1997). Repair in bilingual/bilingual discourse? *Temple University Japan Working Papers in Applied Linguistics, 10,* 14-26.

Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning, 44,* 493-527.

Schegloff, E. (1993). Reflection on quantification in the study of conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 26,* 99-128.

Schegloff, E. (1997). Third turn repair. In G. R. Guy, C. Feagin, D. Schiffrin, & J. Baugh (Eds.), *Toward a social science of language. Papers in honor of Willian Labov* (Vol. 2) (pp. 31-40). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schegloff, E. (2000). When "others" initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics, 21,* 205-243.

Schegloff, E., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53,* 361-382.

Schwartz, J. (1980). The negotiation for meaning: Repair in conversations between second language learners of English. In D. Larsen-Freeman (Ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language research* (pp. 138-153). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Tsujimura, N. (1996). *An introduction to Japanese linguistics.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Varonis, M., & Gass, S. (1985). Non-native/non-native conversations: A model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics, 6,* 71-90.

Wong, J. (2000). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/non-native speaker English conversation. *Applied Linguistics, 21,* 244-267.

Yuri Hosoda holds an Masters of Education Degree in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages from Temple University Japan where she is currently a doctoral student. She has taught English to university students in Japan. Her research interests include conversation analysis, discourse analysis, second language acquisition, and second/foreign language teaching.

Precision Timing in Novice-to-Novice L2 Conversations

Donald Carroll,
Shikoku Gakuin University

That next speakers in talk-in-interaction are capable of precisely timing their entry into the conversational flow is now taken as a given in conversation analytic research. However, the classic studies establishing this fact were based on the analysis of talk between proficient language users, that is, individuals traditionally referred to as "native" speakers. The question then arises as to whether novice-level second language (L2) speakers are similarly capable of precision timing. This paper examines instances of "no-gap" speaker transition, so-called "normal overlap" at transition relevant places, and cases of "turn recycles" in non-pedagogic, casual talk between novice-level Japanese speakers of English (NNS-NNS talk). The primary finding is that novice L2 users can and regularly do start "on time." The paper also explores the possibility that certain inter-turn gaps in the novice L2 data studied here are interactionally occasioned by disfluencies or insufficiencies in prior speaker's turn.

> Someone talks, and I lie back and listen and let them roll for a while. When they're done, there'll be a pause that will flash like a green light to announce that someone else can have the floor.
>
> (Agar, 1994, p. 172)

It is a common belief among the general populace, as well as among many linguists, that people having a conversation just wait for current speaker[1] to stop speaking before taking their turn-at-talk. In other words, they wait for a gap.[2] Yet Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) in their seminal description of a turn-taking system for casual conversation state that participants in talk-in-interaction demonstrate a clear orientation to "no-gap, no-overlap" speaker transition. They observe that "Transitions (from one turn to a next) with no gap and no overlap are common. Together with transitions characterized by slight gap or slight overlap, they make up the vast majority of transitions" (Sacks et al., 1974, pp. 701-702). This orientation to no-gap, no-overlap transitions is one of the cornerstones of the turn-taking system.

No-gap transitions are a natural and demonstrable outcome of participant orientation to rule 1b of Sacks et al. (1974)—the so-called "pressure rule," which states:

> If the turn-so-far is so constructed as not to involve the use of a 'current speaker selects next' technique, then self-selection for next speakership may, but need not, be instituted; *first starter acquires rights to a turn* [my emphasis], and transfer occurs at that place. (p. 704)

As Sacks et al. (1974) point out, speaker transfers do not occur randomly through-out talk but rather cluster around specific locations which they define as *transition relevance places* (TRPs). These are the moments in the on-going stream of talk where current speaker's turn is hearably complete (see the section below on timing entry into talk). And while an entry into talk may or may not occur precisely at a TRP for myriad interactional reasons, conversation analytic researchers now take as given that speakers are *capable* of split-second precision timing, and this em-pirical fact has been well documented (see Jefferson, 1973; Jefferson, 1986; Sacks et al., 1974,). If speakers were not capable of precisely timing their entries into talk, there could be no possible interpretation of either starting too early or too late. It is only by reference to interactionally unmarked positions for speaker transfer, that is at TRPs, that participants can assign meaning to marked positions.

Sacks et al., (1974) do *not* claim that inter-turn gaps do not occur—even a casual glance at any transcript of natural talk reveals that they do occur and occur frequently. Hopper (1992, p. 109) calculates that nearly one-fourth of the speaker transfers in his sample follow a gap. What Sacks et al. (1974) *do* claim is that if gaps do occur, they are not accidental, random or meaningless. In other words, so strong is the orientation towards "no noticeable gap" that the occurrence of an inter-turn gap is treated by participants as performing, or forewarning of, some specific interactional work, such as warning of an incipient dispreferred next ac-tion such as disagreeing with an assessment (Pomerantz, 1984), rejecting an offer, or refusing a request (Davidson, 1984).

Are Novice-Level L2 Users Capable of Precision Timing?

All of the classic studies on precision timing listed above are based on ob-servations of "native speaker" conversations, that is to say, talk between two or more highly proficient users of a language. Native speakers routinely manage to project completion of even complex turns-at-talk. Moreover, there seems to be at least rough agreement among conversation analysts on which features of turn-design participants attend to in projecting up-coming TRPs, for example, prosodic features combined with syntactic and pragmatic completion. Yet despite three de-cades of conversation analytic research, what is really known about the interac-tional skills of non-proficient, that is to say, novice-level, L2 users? Are novice L2 users also capable of precision timing? Do they too orient to TRPs as interactionally unmarked locations for speaker transfer? If so, what features of turn design do novice L2 users attend to in their efforts to project TRPs?

One preliminary observation is that inter-turn gaps appear to be more com-mon in novice-level L2 talk than in proficient speaker talk. In some sections of the data examined in this paper, gaps accompany the majority of speaker transfers, as in Excerpt 1 below. (For details of the transcription conventions used in this paper, see Appendix A.)

(1) [Carroll-99/J's group]
```
01         A:  D'you eat a dinna:
02 ->          (1.9)
03         M:  Uh hss::::: mhmm:: no
04 ->          (0.8)
05         A:  °°no°°
06 ->          (3.6)
07         M:  hah
08             (0.5)
09             how abou $t'you$ (($ symbol marks "smile voice"))
10         A:  Heh heh
11         M:  didya?
12 ->          (0.8)
13         A:  uh yes
14 ->          (1.6)
15         M:  what (1.2) what (0.7) kind of food did you eat
16 ->          (2.1)
17         A:  er (.) Japanese (0.8) Nabe
18 ->          (0.5)
19         M:  nabe (0.5) oh.
20 ->          (1.0)
21         H:  nabe? huh
22         A:  nabe
23 ->          (.)
24         H:  hhh hhh hhh  who did you have a dinner (0.2) wiss
25 ->          (1.5)
26         A:  n:::: (0.7) friends
27 ->          (2.1)
28         H:  how many are zer
29 ->          (2.5)
30         A:  four
31 ->          (0.5)
32         H:  four?
33         A:  I think (.) four
```

Such data potentially present an analytical problem. Are we to conclude that novice-level speakers are not capable of precision timing because of faulty or limited competence and this is why gaps occur so frequently? Do they perhaps follow a different system of turn-taking than proficient speakers? Conversely, if they *are* capable of precision timing but are purposefully withholding or delaying participation or both, do these gaps carry the same sorts of interactional messages that they do in proficient speaker talk, that is, warnings of upcoming troubles or dispreferred next actions? This paper hopes to provide some insight into these questions.

Problems With the "Nonnative Speaker" Label

Throughout this paper the term "novice-level L2 user" is employed instead of "nonnative speaker." There are basically two arguments against using the non-native speaker designation. First, the term can be vague and analytically decep-tive. Second, it is argued below that where this term is used within conversation analytic research it needs to be understood as an interactionally occasioned iden-tity and as such an analyst wishing to so characterize participants would first have to demonstrate through details of a specific spate of talk that it was this nonnative speaker identity which parties-to-the-talk themselves show to be interactionally salient.

Definitional Problems

In the opening to his entry on "native speaker" in *The Encyclopedia of Lan-guage and Linguistics* Alan Davies (1994) writes: "The native speaker, like Lewis Carroll's snark, is a useful and enduring linguistic myth" (p. 2719).[3] Nevertheless, conversation analytic research has overwhelmingly focused on talk between so-called "native speakers," whether they be native speakers of English, German, Japanese, Finnish, Italian, Thai, and so forth (Moerman, 1988; Wagner, 1996). This tacit acceptance of the myth of the native speaker is wide-spread in conversa-tion analytic research. This is perhaps a natural consequence of the field's initial focus on mundane, everyday conversation since for many people, particularly in the U.S. and U.K. (geographic centers for conversation analysis), mundane talk is strongly associated with talk among monolinguals. But on a world-wide scale where bilingualism and multilingualism (including varying degrees of "balance"—Baker, 1996; Hamers & Blanc, 1989) are commonplace, the concept of "native speaker" can be problematic (see Auer, 1984, 1998, for conversation analytic approaches to code-switching). In linguistically more diverse societies commonsense understand-ings of "native speaker" (NS) vs. "nonnative speaker" (NNS) can quickly erode.

A further definitional problem with the NNS designation is that two indi-viduals, both labeled NNSs, can have wildly differing communicative competen-cies. One individual who might, for some institutional or interactional purpose, be regarded as a NNS may have "near-native" control of the language, while another so-called NNS might have difficulty ordering a meal. Indeed, what degree of com-petence is required before the NNS label even becomes applicable? Is someone who speaks just a few words of Japanese a NNS of Japanese? And more to the point, can we, on the empirical evidence available, claim that interaction between highly proficient NNSs differs in any significant way from talk among so-called native speakers, or that talk between a highly proficient NNS and a novice-level NNS would not display the same conversational asymmetries and practices as NS to NNS talk?

Doing Being a NNS

Recently, there has been some interest among researchers embracing conversation analytic methodology in trying to reach an interactional understanding of what it might mean to be (or *do being*) a NNS in talk-in-interaction. If the terms NS and NNS are reconceptualized, now not merely as linguistic states-of-knowledge, but rather as interactionally occasioned and negotiated identities, then perhaps their usefulness can be resurrected. Sacks provides one approach to a new understanding of the terms NS and NNS in one of his early lectures in which he discusses *omni-relevant devices* (Sacks, 1992, p. 314 [Spring, 1966, lecture 6]).

He cites as an example the omni-relevant device "therapist/patients." Sacks' point is that while these categories are not necessarily the salient identities at any given moment, they are identities which are omni-relevant in the sense that participants are always aware of these identity sets whether or not they overtly orient to them as such (Sacks, 1992). In this sense, then, NS/NNS may function as one of Sacks' omni-relevant devices where the NNS identity only becomes relevant in reference to, in other words in opposition to, the NS identity.[4] The labels NS and NNS are, then, identities that participants may invoke for themselves (and display to co-participants), as in Excerpts 2 and 3 below.

In Excerpt 2, by invoking the NS/NNS device and his role as NNS within that device, the author (a professor of English at a Chinese university) is making relevant a participation structure in which NSs help NNSs. Notice also the use of "us" and "you" where the only possible referents are "we nonnative speakers" versus "you native speakers."

(2) [from the Lang-Use e-mail forum][5]

> A main street lined with shops and commercial buildings in the downtown area of my city is closed to all the vehicles. It is now for pedestrians only. We can probably call it a pedestrian(-only) street" *But as a NNS, I would like to know* [my emphasis] if it is acceptable or possible for *us* to call it a "walking street"? Or do *you* have other names for the street of this kind.

In Excerpt 3, K enacts her NNS identity (which both M, in line 23, and Y, in line 26, co-opt) by claiming "I have no English grammar." and "I speak only broken English" —both, by the way, perfectly grammatical utterances. A few lines later she then mimics being a novice EFL student ("It's White-o." "It's red."). Yet this identity is not demonstrably oriented to throughout subsequent parts of this same recording.

(3) [Carroll, 2000/Group 3] – (talk among three Japanese students of English)
```
01        K:  yah ((eating))   [huh huh huh huh huh huh huh huh  [I have ]=
02        Y:                    [huh huh huh huh huh huh huh huh  [huh    ]
03        M:                    [huh huh huh huh huh huh huh huh
04 ->     K:  =$I have no English grammar$
05            (1.1)
```

```
06        M: 1-have-no: Eng [lish grammar
07        Y:              [ah huh huh huh .hhh mm
08           (0.8)
09        Y: mi- miss-u (0.4) Yamada s:::aid
10           (0.8)
11        Y: to [her huh huh
12        K:    [a:
13           (0.2)
14        K: yeah (0.3) I:: (0.6)
15        M: ((clears her throat))
16           (0.5)
17 ->     K: I speak only broken English
18           (0.4)
19        M: AHH
20           (0.8)
21        K: °ok° so::
22           (0.4)
23 ->     M: me too
24           (0.2)
25        K: I'm laughing
26 ->     Y: °yeah         [(me too°)
27        K:               [huh huh [huh huh huh
28        M:                        [huh huh huh .hhh ah-huh
29        K: ok
30        M: uh-h [uh ok] ok  [heheh ok      [ay:::
31 ->     K:      [ok ok]     [(   )         [it's whi:te-o huh=
32           =huh [huh huh huh huh huh huh
33        Y:      [huh huh huh hah hah hah
34        M:      [huh huh huh hah hah hah hah hah huh huh
35        K: huh huh huh huh
36           (.)
37        M: .hhh uh-huh huh huh      [uh
38 ->     K:                    [it's r   [e:::d     [(    )
39        M:                              [u HUH huh huh huh huh huh=
40        Y:                              [huh huh huh huh huh
41        M: =huh huh hu (0.5) .huh
```

Some readers may feel uncomfortable with the idea of NNS-ship as a nego-
tiated identity versus a linguistic fact-of-life. While the NNS label can be undeni-
ably satisfying (as can race terms such as "white" and "black" or professional
labels such as "doctor" or "teacher"), the point here is that the NNS identity is not
always and automatically relevant to an analysis simply by virtue of its being true
(Firth & Wagner, 1997). In his discussion of *procedural relevance,* Schegloff (1992)
states:

> The point is not that persons are somehow *not* male or female, upper or lower
> class, with or without power, professors and/or students. They may be, on
> some occasion, demonstrably members of one or another of those categories.

Nor is the issue that those aspects of the society do not matter, or did not matter on that occasion. We may share a lively sense that indeed they do matter, and that they mattered on that occasion, and mattered for just that aspect of some interaction on which we are focusing. There is still the problem of *showing from the details of the talk or other conduct in the materials* that we are analyzing that those aspects of the scene are what the parties are oriented to. *For that is to show how the parties are embodying for one another the relevancies of the interaction and are thereby producing the social structure.* (pp. 109-110)

In the preceding paragraphs I have argued that the term NNS is most usefully defined in opposition to the NS category and even then may not emerge as interactionally salient during a specific spate of talk. It therefore seems ill-advised to universally apply the NNS label to conversational data in which the language of interaction for all participants involved is a second (or third or nth) language. As this paper concerns itself specifically with interaction between low to low-intermediate level speakers of English as a second language in non-pedagogic situations, I have elected, for the reasons outlined above, not to employ the NS/NNS device/dichotomy but instead characterize the participants in my data as "novice-level" L2 users.

Why Study Novice-to-Novice L2 Interaction?

While some conversation analytic researchers (Kurhila, forthcoming; Wong, 2000a, 2000b) have begun to consider aspects of so-called NS-NNS interactions in conversational, non-pedagogic settings,[6] there has been remarkably little interest in the interactional practices of "NNSs" conversing with other "NNSs" (see, however, Firth, 1995). Yet, statistically, such NNS to NNS talk is more and more likely in today's global environment. Even where so-called NNS data has been examined the participants are likely to be quite proficient speakers (as in Firth's paper). But where are the studies of novice-to-novice interactions? Do such novices follow the same interactional practices as proficient speakers? Can we support the claim that novice-to-novice talk follows the same turn-taking system utilized in proficient user talk? Do, for example, novice L2 users orient to the no-gap, no-overlap rule? If not, what consequences would this have for their interactions?

The remaining sections of this paper will examine various types of evidence that demonstrate the extent to which novice L2 speakers are capable of precisely timing their entry into talk. In the second section, the reader will find a general description of the data and the methods used in their collection. The third section provides a brief overview of how projection of transition relevance places for turn-taking is possible and reviews the pertinent literature. In the fourth section evidence is presented that novice L2 users are regularly capable of split second precision in the timing of their turn start-ups. Finally, the fifth section explores the possibility that certain inter-turn gaps found in this novice L2 data are interactionally occasioned by features of prior speaker's turn design/production.

THE DATA

The data analyzed here come from two video-taped conversations, each approximately 30 minutes long. Despite the fact that the recordings were done as a class assignment for a university-level conversation class in Japan, the talk is non-pedagogic in nature (for conversation analytic descriptions of classroom interaction, see McHoul, 1978; Mehan, 1979; Seedhouse, 1996). The students (all second year English Department students at Shikoku Gakuin University) were asked to arrange themselves into "friendship groups" (Fetzer, 1997) of three.[7] Each group of friends was then given several in-class opportunities to talk casually with each other both in Japanese and English. Each group then made arrangements to get together informally at one of their homes at a time convenient to them. Finally, they were instructed in the use of the video camera.[8]

The first conversation, which I refer to as "M's group," had as its participants three 19-20 year-old Japanese females. Despite the fact that all three had been exposed to six years of formal English instruction prior to entering university, their conversational level was, at best, what might be called low-intermediate. The second conversation, referred to as "J's group," recorded the interaction between four 19-22 year-old males. Three of the four are Japanese and the fourth (the 22 year-old) was a Spanish national who had lived in Japan and attended Japanese public schools since he was 13 years old. In terms of their conversational level, the three Japanese males are best described as "false beginners;" in other words, despite several years of EFL instruction, they still perform at levels similar to beginners. The Spanish national's English is at a much higher level (see Appendix B).

One subjective impression regarding the two conversations is that the talk from M's group appears much more animated and seems to flow much more smoothly than the talk from J's group. This is worth commenting on because both listening and reading scores of the participants in M's group were somewhat lower (see Appendix B). An objective measure of this sense of fluidity is that talk from M's group included far more instances of overlapping talk (and laughter) than J's group. One explanation might be that Japanese females seek affiliation to a greater degree than Japanese males,[9] or the difference may be due to differences in the shared conversational level of the two groups.

The data are best characterized as non-pedagogic, casual talk. Additionally, the label "non-classroom talk" has also been avoided in line with Schegloff's (1992) discussion of *procedural consequentiality* (pp. 110-116), where he points out how methodologically unsatisfactory place formulations of context can be, for example, "in the hospital" or "in the classroom." Talk in a classroom, for example, even between teachers and students, might, from one moment to the next, change from pedagogic to casual and back again. The participants themselves certainly give no indications that they orient to their interaction as "classroom discourse."

There may also be some question as to whether (or to what extent) talk in English among Japanese participants can be regarded as "naturally occurring" talk.

That English would not have been the language of choice does not automatically invalidate the talk or imply that the participants did not view the talk as socially meaningful and consequential. On the contrary, the details of the interaction demonstrate that participants used this talk to enact their social lives, create and reinforce relationships, display identities, etc. Moreover, in any conversational situation there are always constraints of some sort in operation. Bilingual speakers, for example, are rarely free to select one code over another in accordance with personal whim but rather are acquiescing to social or institutional pressures. Seen from this perspective, the data presented here are certainly as natural as those reported on in a number of other conversation analytic studies.

Transcription conventions are provided in Appendix A. However, it is necessary to comment at the outset on one noticeable feature of these transcripts: the general paucity of punctuation indicating intonation. The orthodox symbols for representing pitch movements (in particular those at syntactic boundaries) in conversation analytic research are (.) or (\\) for "final falling," (?) or (/) for "final rising," and (,) for "slight non-final rise." Unfortunately, such a limited symbol set does not begin to cover the range of pitch contours present in this novice L2 data (see Cooper-Kuhlen & Selting, 1996, for a critique of current CA prosodic notation practices). The prosodic features, such as rhythm and pitch, of this talk are often significantly different from what one might expect from so-called native speakers. Japanese speakers of English can often seem to be "speaking in a monotone" —in particular there is often a marked lack of strong final pitch movements. In these transcripts, falling pitch (.), rising pitch (?), or slight non-final rises (,) are indicated only when they could clearly be distinguished as such. Where there is no "line final" punctuation this indicates a "flat and level," interactionally ambiguous pitch status. Finally, it is not at all clear whether these participants orient to prosodic features of the talk in exactly the same way that native speakers would. While this represents a significant area for future research, it is simply beyond the scope of the present paper.

HOW IS IT POSSIBLE TO PRECISELY TIME ENTRY INTO TALK?

In order for next speakers to make the sorts of timely entries into conversation that they regularly do, they must be capable of *projecting*, not just waiting for,[10] upcoming possible transition relevance places (TRPs), that is, those locations in the on-going talk where current speaker's turn-so-far is hearably complete. Understanding how TRP projection is possible is, therefore, of central concern and has evolved into something of a sub-field within conversation analysis (see Cooper-Kuhlen, 1993; Ford, forthcoming; Ford, Fox, & Thompson, 1996; Furo, 1998; Goodwin, 1981; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1987; Jefferson, 1990; Lerner, 1991, 1996; Local & Kelly, 1986; Sacks et al., 1974;[11] Schegloff, 1996; Selting, 1996, 1998).

Stated briefly, Sacks et al. (1974) argue that next speakers are constantly

monitoring the fine details of current speaker's turn-in-progress for clues as to when in the future this turn might reach a state of completion. According to Sacks et al. (1974), turns are composed of one or more, with a built-in bias towards one (Schegloff, 1996), *turn-constructional units* (TCU) where the essential quality of a TCU is its inherent projectability. Sacks et al. (1974) appear to stress the role of syntax in TRP projection by citing "sentential, clausal, phrasal, and lexical constructions" (p. 702) as examples of unit-types for English. However, subsequent research (Ford & Thompson, 1996; Selting 1996, 1998) highlights that it is the interplay of syntactic, prosodic and pragmatic completion which signals upcoming TCU completion. As next speakers monitor current speaker's turn-so-far they are constantly updating and revising their estimate regarding a next possible point of completion.

(4) [Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1978, p. 28]
01   A: I'm glad//I have//you//for a friend.//
02   B: That's because you don't have any others.

(5) [Sacks et al., 1978, p. 28]
01   A: It's not//break time//yet.//
02   B: I finished my box, so shut up.

In Excerpts 4 and 5, A's turns are syntactically complete (in a decontextualized way) at any of the points marked with a double slash. However, the specific content of prior talk may render one or more of these points of syntactic completion *pragmatically incomplete*. Furthermore, prosodic features — including pitch contour, intensity, and speed — contribute to participants' selection of which among several points of syntactic completion to orient to as points of transition relevance. In other words, it is the co-occurrence of syntactic, prosodic and pragmatic completion that signals to next speakers that current speaker's turn might be coming to an end and that they might begin speaking at that point.

EVIDENCE OF PRECISION TIMING IN NOVICE-LEVEL L2 CONVERSATIONS

In talk among proficient users, no-gap transitions are so ubiquitous it is easy to overlook the fact that each instance is a unique conversational achievement. Each demonstrates that next speaker, by virtue of having carefully attended to current speaker's turn-so-far, has been able to successfully project a possible completion point and has precisely timed his or her speech production to begin at just that instant and not a fraction of a second sooner or later.

It bears repeating that according to the Sacks et al.'s (1974) turn-taking system, inter-turn gaps are *always* interpreted by participants as interactionally significant; that is, there are no accidental or random gaps.[12] On the contrary, inter-

turn gaps are a valuable interactional resource available to participants as the following excerpts illustrate:

(6) [Pomerantz, 1984, p. 77]
```
01        B:  ...an' that's not an awful lotta fruitcake
02 ->         (1.0)
03        B:  Course it is.  A little piece goes a long way.
04        A:  Well that's right
```

(7) [Pomerantz, 1984, p. 77 (also Sacks, 1987, p. 64)]
```
01        L:  D'they have a good cook there?
02 ->         (1.7)
03        L:  Nothing special?
04        J:  No. –Every- everybody takes their turns.
```

In Excerpts 6 and 7 the gaps at the arrows communicate meaning just as clearly as any spoken reply might have.[13] In Excerpt 6, B's first turn (at line 1) is a first pair part[14] assessment and as such calls for a second pair part assessment. The second pair part is not merely absent, it is "officially absent" (Schegloff, 1972) thereby displaying to B incipient disagreement (Pomerantz, 1984). B responds to the gap by realigning herself with the position projected by A's silence. Only at this point does A proffer agreement. A similar official absence is noticeable in Excerpt 7 (at line 2); however, in this case it follows L's first pair part question. In line 3, L demonstrates her interpretation of this as meaning "no" (Sacks, 1987) which J then corroborates in line 4. What is apparent, then, is that inter-turn gaps communicate information of the "some trouble here" kind, for example, upcoming disagreements, rejections, refusals, etc. The corollary, of course, is that no-gap transitions are purposeful, skilled achievements specifically executed as such to avoid the implications gaps can signal.

Examples of No-Gap Transitions in Novice L2 Conversation

No-gap transitions are noticeably less common in the novice L2 data examined in this paper (in particular in J's group) than they are in much proficient user talk. Nevertheless, they do occur and as such represent one category of proof that novice L2 users are sensitive to and capable of, at least on occasion, precisely timing their entry into talk. As the following excerpts reveal, the general level of syntactic complexity of the turns in both the J's group and M's group material is relatively low. Turns in the J's group data typically consist of no more than two or three words. Speaker J is the only participant in his group who uses compound structures (Lerner, 1991) such as *if/then* statements. On the surface, the talk from M's group might appear linguistically more sophisticated. However, other than a slightly wider range of active vocabulary, the turns in this talk, though occasionally longer, are also, in general, syntactically uncomplicated (e.g., no compounds, no *if/then* or relative clauses, etc.). We might say that participants in M's group are

just making more out of the same limited resources than are the participants in J's group.

No-Gap Transitions in J's Group Data

The J's group transcript contains no instances of no-gap transitions following syntactically complex turns. However, there are several instances of no-gap transitions following simple turns and each should be valued as the interactional achievement it represents.

In Excerpt 8 below, we see both J and M accomplishing a no-gap transition. In line 2, J grants A's request (in line 1) and does so using the preferred turn shape described by Pomerantz (1984)—with no gap and the preferred action coming early in the turn—in this case making up the entire turn. M (the person who actually brought the chips referred to in line 1 and therefore the one with official rights to say they can be opened) then repeats the granting utterance also allowing no gap after J's turn.

```
(8) [Carroll-99/J's group]
01        A:  can I open it?
02 ->     J:  yeah
03 ->     M:  yeah yeah
04            (1.9)
05        J:  It's not mine but heh heh heh
```

In Excerpt 9, in line 3, A answers H's question stating that four friends came over to dinner. H seeks confirmation in line 5. A, despite being the weakest English speaker in this group, is nevertheless able to start up immediately. M's news-receipt token also allows no gap. J's turn is particularly interesting since prior to the moment he actually utters "have a look at this" he has already been staring down at the "mess" for quite some time. He has strategically delayed his "public noticing" (see Sacks, 1992 [Winter 1969, Lecture 1]) until such time as the prior topic has been concluded and M has completed his turn in line 7. J has precisely timed his noticing to begin with no gap but ends up in slight overlap because M stretches out his production of "un" (similar to "yeah," which in this sequential environment functions as a receipt token). J's actions demonstrate a high level of conversational finesse.

```
(9) [Carroll-99/J's group]
01        H:  how many are zer
02            (2.5)
03        A:  four
04            (0.5)
05        H:  four?
06 ->     A:  I think (.) four
07 ->     M:  un [:::
08 ->     J:      [have look at this (0.2) what a mess (0.2) UUEGH!
```

Throughout the data from J's group it is minimal turns, (e.g., confirmation tokens, receipt tokens, repetitions of various sorts, etc.), which participants are most consistently able to accomplish as no-gap transitions. While the instances below (Excerpts 10-13) may look deceptively simple, these novice L2 (next) speakers are not merely recognizing lexical items under construction; it can be argued that they must also be making the much more sophisticated determination that the turn-so-far (and ultimately the "turn-as-projected"), be it a single word, phrase, clause or sentence, can stand alone as a pragmatically complete whole within the conversational sequence under way.

(10) [Carroll-99/J's group]
```
01       J:  so eh it's (2.5) eh my work starts at eh-u f::ive um (0.6)
02           five thirty and (1.0) finish eh at um:: eight thirty
03           (0.4)
04       M:  eight thirty
05 ->    J:  yeah
06 ->    M:  mmm
```

(11) [Carroll-99/J's group]
```
01       J:  Uuahh:: it's:::
02       M:  mm very (0.8) very (.) hard
03 ->    J:  very hard
```

(12) [Carroll-99/J's group]
```
01       J:  not everyday
02 ->    M:  not everyday
```

(13) [Carroll-99/J's group]
```
01       J:  one hour
02 ->    M:  one [hour
03       J:       [one hour
```

In excerpts 10, 11, and 12, next speakers (at arrows) demonstrate through the timing of their turn beginnings an acceptance of the just prior turn as at least minimally complete in terms of pragmatic content. If this were not the case, it would have been highly unlikely that these next speakers would have begun speaking at these points.

Taking Excerpt 13 as an example, J's first turn might have been extended in any of hundreds of ways, such as "*one hour* is all it took," "*one hour* by car," "*one hour* and you're there," "*one hour* and fifty minutes," "*one hour* if you don't count the rest stops," or "*one-hour* photo labs don't do a very good job, do they." On what basis does M decide that "one hour" is complete? For this we need to consider the preceding talk:

((M has been telling J about one of his three "part-time" jobs. This one, from 8am - 5pm on Saturday, involves doing construction work and J has commented previously that it's a hard job.))
(14) [Carroll-99/J's group]
```
01        M: but (0.7) um (0.8) but (1.5) mmm (0.9) often
02        J:  mhmm.
03        M: we can (1.0) mm rest
04            (0.3)
05        J:  mhmm
06        M: mm (1.4) and sleeping.
07        J:  mm sleeping.
08        M: mheh heh
09            (0.3)
10        J:  one hour?
11 ->     M: one [hour
12        J:       [one hour
13            (0.2)
14        M: mm one two  [(    )
15        J:                  [hour
16            (0.6)
17        M: break
18            (0.6)
19        J:  break
```

In Excerpt 14, M's first turn (spanning lines 1, 3, and 6) attempts to explain, not without considerable difficulty, that his job is not so hard because he can rest and even sleep during working hours. Since M's English level is low, producing anything but the most minimally communicative turns is challenging. As a result, speaker J, who has a higher English level, appears to be helping M along—in much the same way, it should be added, that so-called "native speakers" assist "non-native" speakers. In line 2, J produces a continuer (Heritage, 1984a; Schegloff, 1982) at a point where M's turn (in line 1) is not syntactically complete.[15]

Following M's turn at line 3, J again encourages M to continue first by his lack of uptake and then by providing another continuer in line 5. J then repeats (line 7), *but does not correct,*[16] M's sequentially ungrammatical turn in line 6. In other words, the on-going turn being developed by M would run "But often we can rest and sleeping." J's repetition (falling pitch marks it as a repetition as opposed to a challenge) appears also to function as a continuer returning the floor back to M. Nervous laughter (notice that J doesn't reciprocate this laughter) followed by a silence indicates that M is having some trouble formulating the sort of elaboration J seems to be encouraging. In light of the foregoing discussion then, J's turn in line 10 would appear to be a candidate elaboration regarding how long M can rest or sleep while at work which M ratifies in 11 and then manages to actually expand on in 17 (possibly also in 14). So it is the sequence as a whole up to that point which allows M to determine that J's turn "one hour" in line 10 is, in fact, pragmatically

complete.

In summary, the talk from J's group contains several instances of no-gap speaker transition demonstrating that even novices at an extremely low conversational level are capable of immediate start up. This is no small accomplishment. In order to have managed this interactional task participants in this talk must be carefully monitoring the moment by moment production of current speaker's turn as well as attending to the overall trajectory of the sequence.

No-Gap Transitions in the M's Group Data

The talk from M's group would strike most observers as noticeably more fluent, in terms of the turn transitions, than talk from J's group. Therefore, instead of looking at isolated instances of no-gap transitions as we did with the J's group materials, it is worth examining a more extended (and more or less self-contained) spate of talk. Looking at a more extended episode of talk will also provide a better feel for the nature of the Japanese-Japanese novice L2 talk examined in this study.

In the following extended excerpt there are only 13 instances (marked with an arrow) of no-gap speaker transition. However, if we include transitions where laughter forms the next turn (marked with "L"), transitions at TRPs but in overlap (marked with "O"), and transitions involving very brief silences (measurable[17] but possibly "unnoticeable" for participants; marked with "*"), this brings the total of no-gap transitions to 38 out of approximately 70 speakers' transitions. It seems very likely that it is this higher incidence of no-gap transitions which creates the impression of fluency in the casual observer's mind.

(15) [Carroll-99/M's group]
```
01        S:  un:: Madoka?
02            (0.6)
03        M:  $yeah?$ (($ symbol marks "smile voice"))
04            (0.8)
05 O      S:  you: [::
06        M:       [$wha's za matter$
07 L      K:  huh huh huh hum
08        M:  hhh
09            (0.5)
10        S:  you don'(t) to:: (1.2) to: eat-u sweet-u food
11            (0.6)
12        M:  ohn [::
13 O      S:        [o-a (("or")) (0.4) you:: (0.5) get(0.4)-o (0.4)
14            you'll get (.) bad (.) teeth
15 ->     M:  °°ohn ohn°°
16            (1.0)
17        K:  don'tchu? (.) don'tchu e-eat? (0.4) don't eat too much=
18            =chocolates
19 ->     M:  no(.) $why?$ hah hah
20        K:  .hhh or you(hu) wi(h)ll ha(h)ve-a (0.6) no slim
```

```
21 ->    M:  NO? ha-hu-huh
22           (0.6)
23       S:  no [slim?]
24 O     M:     [NO: ] no: no problem (0.5) my teeth is very=
25           =beautifu [l
26 L     K:              [h-huh [huh huh
27       S:                     [BEAUtiful?
28       M:  ye:s and-u (0.2) if I:: (0.6) eat a lot-a I don't eat=
29           =a lot (0.7) uh: it's all right
30           (0.3)
31       S:  u::n [n::?
32 O     M:       [do you $think so(h)$?
33 *         (.)
34       K:  do you have a bad teeth?
35           (0.4)
36       M:  no
37           (0.4)
38       K:  no me too
39           (1.0) ((gazing at S))
40       K:  do you have  [(   )
41       S:               [o::(hn
42           (1.0)
43       K:  °do you have-a (.) bad teeth°
44 *         (.)
45       S:  Bad teeth? um:: a little
46 L     K:  [[huh huh huh huh huh
47 L     M:  [[huh huh huh
48           (0.8)
49       S:  so I::: (.) my teeth i:s: (1.1) [um
50       M:                                  [un
51           (0.9)
52       S:  [[I-I    sink-u           ]beau-beautiful
53       K:  [[number number one ]
54 *         (.)
55       K:  $number one in Kagawa pre(h)fecture(h)$ [heh heh heh=
56 O     S:                                          [(aah oh!)
57 ->    S:  [yes  [yes  [I:::
58       K:  [=heh [.hhh [huh huh huh [huh
59       S:                           [Whe:::::n
60       K:  hhh huh huh
61           (0.3)
62       S:  un:: when I was (0.8) my::
63           (2.8)
64       M:  eh? your elementary school?
65           (0.3)
66       S:  un elementary [school
67 O     M:                [me too! me too!
68       S:  elementary schoo::l
```

```
69              (0.6)
70      M: goo [:: g   ]ood child-uren
71      S:      [when ]
72              (0.6)
73      S: so [(              )        [I'm=
74      M:     [degrees of good chi:ld [re:n
75      S: =grand prix
76 L    K: [[hah hah hah hah hah hah hah hah hah
77 L    M: [[hah hah
78      S: [[I-I attend grand prix (.) eh [of-u   ] (0.4) Kagawa=
79      K:                               [huheh ]
80      S: =pre [fecture
81      K:      [huh huh
82 ->   M: Oh-oh-oh oh-oh-oh! ((K claps hands))
83 ->   K: that's great
84 ->   M: that's grea::t ((claps hands))
85 ->   S: but-u::: zese days (0.3) my teeth is mm::::
86 ->   M: bad-o heh heh
87      K: [[huhm ]
88      S: [[hm   ]
89              (0.7)
90      S: little dirty::
91 L    M: [[heh heh heh hch hch hch
92 L    K: [[hch hch hch hch hch hch little dirty
93 ->   S: dirty
94 ->   K: [[no
95 L    M: [[hmm
96 ->   S:  no
97 ->   K: very beautiful
98 ->   M: white-u (0.4) heh huh huh
99      S: white?
100 O   M: your tees [ss::: ] is white [-u
101     S:          [sanks ]        [zank you[zank you
102     M:                                   [perhaps
103 *          (.)
104     K: I don't like my teess:
105 L   S: [[HUH HUH HUH
106 L   M: [[huh huh huh
107             (0.5)
108     M: why?
109 *          (.)
110     S: your teess pretty [heh heh heh ((pointing at K's teeth))
111 O   K:                   [no::
112 L   M:                   [hch hch hch hch hch
113     K: tsu-two (0.2) teess
114             (0.3)
115     M: ye:s?
116             (0.7)
```

```
117      K: w- I don't like
118         (2.1) ((M nods head))
119      S: don't mind
120         (0.3)
121      K: heh heh heh $thank you$ huh
122         (1.3)
```

As was the case with the J's group materials, many of the no-gap transitions in the M's group data involve minimal turns such as repetitions of various sorts (see section on "recycles" below), acknowledgement tokens, one-word questions, or fixed expressions. Nevertheless, of particular interest is the segment running from line 78-86 (and renumbered at 16 below) where S finally manages to tell, in the clear, the news that she attended the "grand prix," a final level competition for good dental hygiene in elementary school.

```
(16) [Carroll, 1999/M's group]
78        S: [[I-I attend grand prix (.) eh [of-u   ] (0.4) Kagawa=
79        K:                              [huheh ]
80        S: =pre [fecture
81        K:      [huh huh
82 ->     M: Oh-oh-oh oh-oh-oh! ((K claps hands))
83 ->     K: that's great
84 ->     M: that's grea::t ((claps hands))
85 ->     S: but-u::: zese days (0.3) my teeth is mm::::
86 ->     M: bad-o heh heh
```

M in monitoring the production of S's turn-so-far (in line 78) has no difficulty projecting that S's turn will come to a point of possible completion at the end of "prefecture." The designation "Kagawa" (one of Japan's 47 prefectures) would have been pragmatically and syntactically complete in this context, however, there is no terminal fall (or corresponding terminal rise; Local, 1986; Wells & Peppé, 1996) in intonation. Instead, pitch is held level thereby projecting more talk to come. M's reduplicative receipt/appreciation token at line 82 (coming immediately after "prefecture") is quite common in Japanese female speech ("un-un-un" in Japanese) and as such represents a projectable unit. Similarly, K's appreciative assessment "That's great" is also a stock phrase and therefore easily projectable. M mirrors, and slightly upgrades, K's appreciation (and also K's clapping action). S then comes in immediately with what can be considered a back down from her boast in lines 78-80. As S searches for an adequate completion for "my teeth is…" she fills a potential silence with "mm" and extends this until, at last, M comes to the rescue, providing the candidate completion "bad" in line 86 which S subsequently accepts in a down-graded fashion ("a little dirty").

What is notable here is that five turns (lines 82-86) have been done in rapid succession with no gap and no overlap. For L2 speakers at this conversational level this is no mean accomplishment and, as was the case with the no-gap speaker

transitions in J's group talk, highlights the subtle control that even novice L2 speakers have over turn-taking. While not all of the talk from M's group exhibited this same degree of rapid turn exchange, the fact that even limited spates of talk can be carried out in this manner demonstrates that novice L2 speakers are *capable* of attending to the necessary level of detail and capable of precisely timing the start-up of at least a limited set of turn types.

No-Gap Transitions in Non-Overlapping Parallel Conversations

One of the most striking displays of precision timing, albeit of a slightly different nature, in the J's group talk occurs when there is a temporary schisming of one conversation into two: between M and A on the one hand and between J and S on the other. M and A are engaged in a somewhat halting conversation beginning with the archetypal EFL question "what did you do today?" J, who has been out of the room preparing food, comes back in and offers S ("Shinmyo," a non-participant friend of Speaker J who is overseeing the operation of the camcorder) something to drink. This is the only time during the taping that S speaks.

(17) [Carroll-99/J's group]

	Conversation between M and A		Conversation between J and S
01	M: what (0.8) did you do (0.6) today		
02	(0.7)		
03	A: un (1.3) l (2.1) l had my /hai../ hair (0.5) cut		
04	(.)		
05	M: hair cut		
06	(0.9)		
07	? ((clears throat))		
08	(1.6)		
09	((clears throat))		
10	? (2.8)		
11	A: i- Okayama		
12	M: [[in Okayama?]	12	J: [[pss] pss, Shinmyo
13		13	J: How 'bout this ((to S))
14	M: Heh huh		
15	A: Heh		
16	M: Why why		
17	(0.7)		
18	A: uh:::[::	18	J: [beer. ((to S))
19	(2.0)		
20	A: my hometown		
21		21	J: eh? wassa ((to S))
22		22	(2.1)
23		23	S: mhm I want beer ((to S))
24		24	(0.5)
25		25	J: beer. ((to S))

26	M: Okayama		
27	A: Okayama		
28		28	J: not water ((to S))
29		29	(0.8)
30		30	heh heh
31		31	S: huh huhn- of course
32		32	((to I))
			J: you're w(h)orking (0.3) heh ((to S))
33		33	(0.4)
34		34	S: so fuckin' wha ((to I))
35		35	J: heh heh
36		36	(1.1)
37	M: when when		
38		38	J: eh (0.8) watch out your mouth (0.5) heh ((to S))
39	M: did you		
40	(0.4)		
41		41	S: OKAY:: ((to I))
42	(0.9)		
43	M: come (1.7) back (0.6) $ho(h)meto(H)wn$		
44	(1.3)		
45	A: n?		
46	(1.1)		
47	M: yester (0.4) day		
48	(0.5)		
49	A: iie (1.2) today [(( ))		
50	M: [today		
51	(2.6)		

What makes this spate of talk so interesting is not merely that two conversations are going on simultaneously, that is, M talking with A and J talking with S, but rather that the two conversations are perfectly fitted around one another—there are only two instances of overlap between the two conversations (in lines 12 and 18). The first marks the beginning of the parallel conversations and the second is a simple case of transition space onset in which next speaker aims for the transition space, but current speaker lengthens the last word.

Although the two conversations are separate, they have a curiously symbiotic relationship. One has the impression that M and A's talk is the "main" conversation but that it progresses in fits and starts—something like dragging a stick slowly across the slats in a picket fence. J, and to some degree S, fit their turns-at-talk into the gaps in between. Clues that J regards his conversation with S as secondary to and possibly intrusive on the "main" conversation between M and A are seen first in his use of "pss" in line 12 and then in the general brevity of his turns.

His attempts to time his "asides" to S to fit into the gaps in M and A's talk further support this interpretation.

While participants in each conversation give no indications that they are aware of the content of talk from the other conversation, they are clearly closely monitoring what is being said in order to time their turn start-ups. For example, in line 16, M inquires into why A got his hair cut in Okayama—a city located an hour away. In line 20, A completes his explanation of why he cut his hair in Okayama. Precisely at the completion of this phrase, J continues his talk with S where he confirms (in line 25) that S wants beer. Once again, precisely at the termination of I saying "beer," in line 26, M continues, *as if there had been no intervening talk*, checking that Okayama was indeed A's hometown and A immediately confirms this fact. At this point, J checks again that it is beer and *not* water that S wants (J is holding up a bottle of water in line 13 and is perhaps concerned about his cameraman "drinking on the job"). This segment alone demonstrates how carefully participants attend to both their own talk as well as talk around them.

Instances of Normal Overlap in Novice-Level L2 Conversation

In addition to no-gap next turn start-ups, some overlaps also provide evidence of speakers' ability to precisely time their participation in interaction. While one robust finding of conversation analytic research is that overwhelmingly only one party speaks at a time (Sacks et al., 1974), overlapping talk, nevertheless, occurs and occurs frequently—and there is no inconsistency in this. A great many instances of overlap are a natural consequence of the turn-taking system in that upon completion of a TCU, next speakers may self-select, but current speaker may also elect to continue his or her speaking turn by adding to the ongoing turn resulting in what is called "normal" overlap. Consider the following two examples from proficient user talk:

(18) [MDE:60:1:6:1]
```
01        S:  hello:?
02        H:  hello is Lila home?
03        S:  n-no she's no:t.  she:'s et school.
04        H:  yeh d'you know what time she'd be back in t'day?
05            (0.2)
06        S:  zis Harriet?
07        H:  yeah.
08 ->     S:  hi Harriet.//[uh about fi:ve.
09 ->     H:             [hi:.
```

(19) [NB:II:2:29]
```
01 ->     E:  god it's it's it's su:n's comin' out//[real ni:ce. ]
02 ->     N:                                        [yeh I noti ]ced that
03            (.)
04        N:  I notice˙ that.  That's great.
```

In both Excerpts 18 and 19, current speaker (at the first arrow) has come to

a point (marked with a double slash) where what is being said is hearably complete. In Excerpt 18, S greets H saying "Hi, Harriet" at which point H returns the greeting (at second arrow). However, S does not stop speaking but rather continues with "uh about fi:ve" which addresses H's query in line 4. The result is overlapping talk. Similarly, in Excerpt 19 (line 1), E states "Sun's coming out." At this point, H responds with "Yeh, I noticed that." However, E expands on "sun's coming out..." by adding the adverbial "real nice."

Instances of normal overlap, thus, further demonstrate participant ability to precisely time turn start-ups. In proficient user talk the onset of overlap regularly coincides with TRPs, but can we also find instances of normal overlap in novice L2 talk? As it turns out, there are several instances of normal overlap in both J's group talk and M's group talk. In Excerpt 20 (line 2), J replies to M's first pair part summons ("Zak" is J's nickname) but M tags on the question "how long" in reference to prior talk about working hours. The result is a brief period of overlapping talk.

```
(20) [Carroll-99/J's group]
01       M: Zak [how     ]long=
02 ->    J:      [mhmm?] ((J is gazing elsewhere))
03       M: =eh .hss (0.8) did-you (1.6) did-you:: work °°work work°°
```

In Excerpt 21, after a bit of confusion in lines 8-12, M provides a minimal one-word expansion (line 14) on the nature of his job (he does tile roofing for Japanese-style houses). J's exclamatory "ah" shows he recognizes "Japanese" before M has fully completed his production of the word. Jefferson (1973) refers to this as "recognitional onset."

```
(21) [Carroll-99/J's group]
01       J:  what's (.) what's your (0.2) job (0.7) your (0.4)
02           part-time job
03           (2.0)
04       M: ((     ))
05           (1.3)
06       J:  what's ah
07           (0.3)
08       M: mmmm
09           (1.8)
10           ahh (0.4) on loof (0.3) heh heh heh
11           (0.3)
12       J:  ohh ahhh! (0.5) a roof (.) roof (.) made the roof
13           (0.4)
14       M: mm japane[se
15 ->    J:          [ah ma- making japanese roof
16           (0.2)
17       J:  ((clears throat))
```

```
18            (0.2)
19            whoa[::
20    M:         [ehem
21            (0.8)
```

Excerpt 22 follows on from Excerpt 21. Speaker J and M are discussing the hours that they work and how much they earn. In the first instance of overlap in Excerpt 22 (lines 26 and 27), J's confirmation "from 5 p.m." is also hearably complete after "five" and M provides a minimal news-receipt token ("mm" can be considered a reduction of the fuller Japanese "un") at this time resulting in overlap. Again in lines 40 and 41, in the context of his question in line 37, J's rephrasing of "how bout the money" as "how much" can certainly be heard as complete and M does, in fact, begin his turn with a turn-claiming token at this point.

```
(22) [Carroll-99/J's group]
22       J:  ts- n sounds (1.3) like (.) em (0.3) hard job
23           (0.8)
24       M:  yes it's eight (1.4) to eight from (1.1) five p.m.
25           (1.0)
26 ->    J:  ((clears throat)) from five [p.m.]
27 ->    M:                              [mm ] and  [(           )
28       J:                                          [but not everyday
29           (1.5)
30       J:  not everyday
31       M:  not everyday
32           (0.8)
33           only Saturday
34           (.)
35       J:  Saturday ha' ha' ha' ((Japanese comprehension marker))
36           (0.4)
37           and how bout the the money
38           (1.3)
39       M:  hmm
40 ->    J:  how much:: [do you gain ]
41 ->    M:            [hmm:::::::::::]
42           (2.5)
43           mmm (1.2) seven thousand (0.7) yen
```

The next few instances of normal overlap come from M's group and reveal a clear orientation on the part of these participants to TRPs as locations for speaker transfers. In Excerpt 23 below, M offers a candidate completion (in line 3) for S's word search (in line 1). By beginning with "your," M is taking up the structural pattern of S's reformulation begun with "my." Speaker S accepts the candidate item; first with an affirmative "un" ("yeah") and then by repeating the candidate item. In this sequential context, the word "elementary" by itself is hearably complete and this is the precise point at which M begins speaking.

(23) [Carroll-99/M's group]
```
01        S:  um:: when I was (0.8) my
02            (2.8)
03        M:  eh? your elementary school?
04            (0.3)
05        S:  un elementary [school
06 ->     M:              [me too! me too!
```

In Excerpt 24, K's turn is complete both syntactically and pragmatically after "very far."[18] Coparticipants' orientation to this as a TRP is demonstrated in a particularly robust manner in that both S and M begin laughing[19] at precisely the same moment.

(24) [Carroll-99/M's group]
```
01        K:  my home town Kochi is very far [from here,
02 ->     S:                        .        [huh huh
03 ->     M:                                 [heh heh huh
```

Excerpt 25 illustrates that TRP projection is not something current speakers necessarily do for the benefit of next speakers but rather a case of next speakers continually updating their "best guess" as to when the turn-in-progress is *possibly* complete for them. In line 11, K comments that it is alright to eat a lot since "today is special day." S, however, begins speaking after "special" showing that she hears the turn under construction as syntactically and pragmatically complete at the end of "today is special," despite the lack of clear terminal pitch movement over "special." Note that had K formulated her turn in a grammatically correct manner as "Today is *a* special day," the turn-so-far would not have been complete after "special."[20]

(25) [Carroll-99/M's group]
```
01        M:  hhh .hh we may eat a lot
02            (0.3)
03        S:  it's yummy=
04        M:  =sure
05            (1.1)
06        M:  mm: but we must be grow fat?
07            (1.4)
08        K:  no problem heh heh
09        M:  [[heh heh heh
10        S:  [[no problem
11        K:  today is specia[l day
12 ->     S:               [don't mind
13        K:  today is ok
14        M:  Oh. I see
```
These instances of normal overlap in both J's group talk and M's group talk

represent one of the strongest forms of evidence that the novice L2 speakers in this data *do* orient to TRPs as locations for speaker transfer and *do* attempt to precisely time their turn-entries to coincide with these moments. Moreover, they are regularly successful at doing so.

Instances of Recycled Turn Beginnings

One further class of conversational phenomena which supports the position that novice-level L2 speakers do attend to the precise timing of both their own talk as well as that of their coparticipants is that of recycled turn beginnings. Throughout the 60s and 70s mainstream linguistics dealt with restarts primarily as "performance errors," a sort of syntactic stuttering. However, Schegloff (1987) demonstrates that many instances of repetition are not "errors" but are, in fact, carefully timed strategic restarts designed to safeguard potentially important turn-beginnings from overlap (see also French & Local, 1983). The data from my novice L2 users reveal several instances of such recycled turn beginnings (Excerpts 26-31).

Turn recycles demonstrate a different sort of attention to timing. In this case, participants are not exactly projecting upcoming TRPs but rather are attending to the fine details of overlapping talk in order to determine who will "survive" the overlap as the current speaker and exactly when the survivor may begin speaking in the clear.

```
(26) [Carroll-99/M's group]
01       K:  huh  [huh huhm]
02 ->    S:       [Keiko::  ] Keiko:: drink juices too much
```

```
(27) [Carroll-99/M's group]
01       S:  here you are
02           (0.5)
03       K:  Thank you
04           (2.3)
05       S:  [[You   drink    too]
06 ->    M:  [[I-I-I want to drink] want to drink-u
```

```
(28) [Carroll-99/M's group]
01       S:  me? Me?
02       K:  Why don't yo [u eat   ] ((talking while eating))
03 ->    M:               [de-     ] decrease decrease
```

```
(29) [Carroll-99/M's group]
01       K:  I shink I shink (0.8) castela²¹ (0.3) this castela=
02           =is little yucky
03       M:  why:::?
04       S:  [[why::? ]
06 ->    K:  [[this cas]tela castela is u- (0.2) delicious but=
07           =this castela is yucky
```

(30) [Carroll-99/M's group]
```
01       K: I-I::: (0.9)I don't eat this
02          (1.0)
03       S: [[Madoka?   ]
04 ->    M: [[you don't   ] don't have to (            )
```

(31) [Carroll-99/M's group]
```
01       S: so:: [a::::n::::d   ]-u
02 ->    M:      [besi-beside ]
03       S: no huh huh hu [h huh ] no(h) [huh huh          ]
04       M:                 [sorry ]      [besides I:      ]::
05          (0.4)
06 ->    M: I:: (0.2) can't-share- you::r (0.5) gran-ofather huhh
```

It is worth discussing this last example (Excerpt 31) in some detail as it reveals just how closely the two participants are monitoring each others' overlapping talk. Just prior to this talk M and K have been speaking about a visit to K's hometown, and this talk appeared to have reached a conclusion. At this point (line 1), following a gap of 0.7 second, S produces "so::" which in this context might be seen by coparticipants as a topic-concluding move. That M does, indeed, interpret this as an attempt at topic closure is demonstrated by her use of "besides" indicating that she has more to say on the prior topic. S, however, tags "and" on to her turn-so-far and thus S and M find themselves in overlap.

S and M first become aware that they are speaking in overlap during the first beat[22] of the overlapping talk, in what Schegloff (2000) terms the *post-onset phase* (also see Jefferson & Schegloff, 1975). Their first opportunity to display to each other their awareness of this fact comes in the second beat. And indeed, looking at the transcript, both S and M seem to orient to the overlap, S by stretching out the performance of her first beat beyond the syllable boundary of M's first beat (see below) while M cuts off the production of her first attempt at "besides" before beginning a recycle.

Beat1	Beat2	Beat3	Beat4
[a::::	::	n::::	d]-u
[be	si	be	side]

If S had produced the word "and" in a typical fashion, it would have been projectably complete at about the same time that M begins her recycle (beat 3). However, S does not reach completion at this point. By stretching out her production of "and," she confounds M's attempt to project its completion so that S and M find themselves once again in overlap in beat 3. In beat 4, M displays her awareness of this overlap by withholding the production of the final "s" of "besides." In the end, S emerges as the "surviving" rightful speaker—notice that the tail end of her "a:::n::::du" is produced in the clear. Had S not chosen to add the vocalic release to the end of "and," both S and M would have finished at exactly the same

time and next speakership would still be up for grabs.

While turn recycles do not directly address the issue of whether novice L2 speakers are capable of precisely timing their turn entries, recycles do illustrate just how closely even novice L2 speakers monitor, and react to, the unfolding interaction. As such they represent an important class of supporting evidence for the main argument.

EXTENSIVE PAUSES AND GAPS IN NOVICE L2 TALK

Up to this point this paper has argued that the novice L2 users in this study are capable of precisely timing their entry into talk and has presented several types of evidence for this, including no-gap start-ups, instances of normal overlap, and turn recycles. However, as mentioned in the introduction, the novice L2 talk examined in this paper is often heavily punctuated with inter-turn gaps, and the turns themselves often contain intra-turn pauses. Looking again at Excerpt 1 from J's group (renumbered below as 32), most casual observers, on an impressionistic level, would find this talk rather disfluent or disjointed.

```
(32) [Carroll-99/J's group]
01        A: D'you eat a dinna:
02 ->        (1.9)
03        M: Uh .hss::::: mhmm:: no
04 ->        (0.8)
05        A: °°no°°
06 ->        (3.6)
07        M: hah
08           (0.5)
09           how abou $t'you$
10        A: Heh heh
11        M: didya?
12 ->        (0.8)
13        A: uh yes
14 ->        (1.6)
15        M: what (1.2) what (0.7) kind of food did you eat
16 ->        (2.1)
17        A: er (.) Japanese (0.8) Nabe
18 ->        (0.5)
19        M: nabe (0.5) oh.
20 ->        (1.0)
21        H: nabe? huh
22        A: nabe
23 ->        (.)
24        H: hhh hhh hhh  who did you have a dinner (0.2) wiss
25 ->        (1.5)
26        A: n::::: (0.7) friends
27 ->        (2.1)
```

```
28        H: how many are zer
29 ->         (2.5)
30        A: four
31 ->         (0.5)
32        H: four?
33        A: I think (.) four
```

Out of the 17 speaker transitions in this excerpt, 13 involve (often lengthy) inter-turn gaps. This situation raises several important analytic questions. According to Sacks et al. (1974), inter-turn gaps are treated by participants as interactionally significant. But is this really the case with novice L2 data? And if not, what status would these gaps and pauses have in the unfolding of talk? Conversely, if these gaps *are* treated by participants as meaningful, do they carry the same interactional loadings as gaps in proficient user talk?

One way out would be to side-step the whole issue by saying: "Well, they are, after all, speaking a foreign language." Another approach would be to resort to factors external to the talk, such as nervousness about being videotaped, social distance factors, and differing cultural orientations regarding silence and the need to talk.[23] Given, however, that the participants in this data have shown that they are, at least on occasion, able to precisely time their turn entry, it is worth exploring the possibility that the *apparent* disfluency is, at least partially, interactionally occasioned. In other words, it may be demonstrably the case that some limited set of the inter-turn gaps in this data are responsive to deficiencies in the prior turn's production or design or both.

Sequential Implication of Excessive Intra-Turn Pausing

Virtually all the extended turns, that is to say, turns consisting of more than two or three words and typically constructed as "sentences," from J's group, and to a somewhat lesser extent from M's group, exhibit disfluency in the form of multiple, and often lengthy, intra-turn pauses. The pacing[24] of this talk is highly erratic and normal speakers might find listening to such talk laborious.

In all four of the excerpts below the turn prior to the (arrowed) gap is hearably complete; that is, in all cases the prior turn reaches a point of syntactic, pragmatic and prosodic completion (all four end in marked falling pitch). Yet, in each of these four excerpts, next speakers allow a gap. In fact, nowhere in my data is such a *haltingly produced turn* ever subject to overlap, nor is there a single instance of no-gap transition following such a turn. Excerpts 33 to 36 below are respresentative examples.

```
(33) [Carroll-99/J's group]
01        M: ah (2.0) um (1.7) today I (0.8) work (1.7) at (1.0)
02            eight am.
03 ->         (0.5)
04        J: eight a.m. mm
```

(34) [Carroll-99/J's group]
01   J: ts- n sounds (1.3) like (.) em (0.3) hard job.
02 ->   (0.8)
03   M: yes it's eight (1.4) to eight from (1.1) five pm
04   J: ((clears throat)) from 5 p.m.

(35) [Carroll-99/J's group]
01   J: and um (0.7) from::: Monday to:: (0.5) Saturday.
02 ->   (0.3)
03   M: mmm

(36) [Carroll-99/M's group]
01   S: you don't to: (1.2) to eat sweet food (0.8) or
02   (0.3) you:: (0.4) get-o (0.3) you'll get bad teeth.
03 ->   (1.3)
04   K: don't you don't e'at (0.4) don't eat too much chocolates

Consider Excerpt 33. Earlier, we saw that the novice L2 participants in this data are certainly capable of doing simple, no-gap repetitions. Yet, in Excerpt 33, speaker J, who has the highest level of English of any of the participants, allows a half-second gap before his repetition. Why is this the case? That answer may lie in the observation that in the prior turn M pauses between almost every word, not just "micro-pauses" but significant pauses ranging from 0.8 second to 2.0 seconds (Jefferson, 1987). Although M's turn is syntactically as well as pragmatically complete (in the context of J's prior talk telling about his part-time job) after "work," there is a slight non-final pitch rise on "work" marking that there is more to come. M then continues with "at" which allows a lexico-syntactic slot for either a time or a place. Once M begins production of "eight" it must, at this point, be apparent to J which has been selected, and it should be unproblematic to project a point of possible next completion. Nevertheless, J fails to time his repetition to coincide with the completion of M's turn.

This suggests the possibility that M's halting production of his turn has "desensitized" J's orientation to what Sacks et al. (1974, p. 719) describe as "the pressure for early starts on self-selectors, resulting from the 'first starter goes' provision..." In other words, it is interactionally safer given the halting nature of M's turn production[25] to just wait for M to stop speaking—as alluded to in the quote from Agar at the beginning of this paper. Remember as well that accomplishing precision timing is always a delicate balance between not starting too late and not starting too early. That is to say, next speakers orient to both no-gap *and* no-overlap transitions. Therefore, when confronted with such disfluent turns and the dilemma they present, next speakers may prefer to delay speaking in an effort to conform to the no-overlap rule.

Because this is an important point it bears restating. Where current speaker's turn is produced in an erratic fashion with numerous false starts and/or lengthy intra-turn pauses, there may be a "relaxation" of the first starter rule such that,

being unable to project a precise moment of possible completion, next speakers choose to wait for a slight gap. Participants may see this as an interactionally safer alternative to possibly starting too early—an action that can be negatively interpreted as interruption. That is to say, if next speakers are forced *by an exceptional lack of projectability in a novice speaker's turn-so-far* to choose between the possibility of starting too early with its associated negative consequences and alternatively waiting until current speaker has definitely finished, there may be a preference for the latter.

Possible Consequences of Marginally Sufficient Responses

The impression one gets while viewing the segment of the tape represented in Excerpt 37 is that this group of participants is having a hard time getting the conversation going (this occurs towards the beginning of the recording). The talk seems almost painfully slow. Furthermore, what emerges is a view of conversation as little more than a series of Question (Q) and Answer (A) sequences.[26]

(37) [Carroll-99/J's group]
((for emphasis, questions are bolded, and answers are bolded and italicised))

```
Q ->     09 how abou $t'you$
         10 A:  Heh heh
Q ->     11 M:  didya?
         12     (0.8)
A ->     13 A:  uh yes
         14     (1.6)
Q ->     15 M:  what (1.2) what (0.7) kind of food did you eat
         16     (2.1)
A ->     17 A:  er (.) Japanese (0.8) Nabe
         18     (0.5)
         19 M:  nabe (0.5) oh.
         20     (1.0)
Q ->     21 H:  nabe? huh
A ->     22 A:  nabe
         23     (.)
Q ->     24 H:  hhh hhh hhh  who did you have a dinner (0.2) wiss
         25         (1.5)
A ->     26 A:  n:::: (0.7) friends
         27         (2.1)
Q ->     28 H:  how many are zer
         29     (2.5)
A ->     30 A:  four
         31     (0.5)
Q ->     32 H:  four?
         33 A:  I think (.) four
```

In lines 13, 17, 22, 26, and 30 of Excerpt 37, speaker A provides only marginally sufficient answers to questions—in most cases a single word, the sole ex-

ception being "Japanese nabe" (line 17). Note that the determination of marginally sufficient is not a question only for the analyst: Speaker A's laugh tokens, in line 10, are not accepted by recipient M as marginally sufficient, prompting M to immediately rephrase the question in line 11. Speaker M treats a response by speaker A as *officially absent*.

What is interesting from an interactional perspective is that each of A's marginally sufficient responses is followed by a gap. In principle, there is no reason why a one-word turn can't form a perfectly adequate and satisfying reply to a question. However, the questions in this excerpt are more than mere requests for information: In the sequential environment in which they occur (toward the beginning of the talk) they are clearly intended as attempts to get the conversation rolling. The fact that neither M nor H chooses to immediately self-select at the conclusion of A's minimal responses indicates that they may have expected more and that their silence is meant to pursue an elaboration by A. In other words, speaker A's marginal responses to his coparticipants' topic openers fail to promote further talk on the topic proposed by M and H's questions.

Beach (1996), Schlegel (1998), and Ford (forthcoming) all mention the use of silence following minimal turns as an elicitation device in proficient user talk. Ford's paper deals specifically with turns initiated with disaffiliative, negatively framed TCUs.[27] Stated simply, her paper shows that, in certain contexts, coparticipants regularly treat unexpanded, negatively framed turns as problematic. In the case of the data excerpt examined in this section, speaker A provides unelaborated, minimal responses to both yes/no and wh-questions. M and H treat A's responses as unsatisfactory/problematic as indicated by the immediately subsequent gaps in lines 14, 18, 23, 27, and 31. In other words, both M and H noticeably (for both A and overhearing analysts alike) display a lack of immediate uptake following A's unelaborated responses, which is similar to what Beach and Ford find in proficient speaker data.

In proficient user talk, unexpanded responses such as B's turns in the following invented example might be interpreted as unwillingness to talk (at least on this topic or with this individual).

(38) [Invented example]
A: Weather's supposed to be great tomorrow.
B: I guess.
A: Is Alice coming by?
B: no.
A: You gonna go to the beach?
B: Yes.

In reply to A's last question, a more sociable speaker B might have provided an elaborated response[28] along the lines of "(Yeah) if the weather's OK" or "Uhh I have to work so probably not." Minimal responses such as A's in Excerpt 37 may well strike proficient users as evasive, brusque, curt, secretive, apprehensive, and

so forth. Wolfson (1989) notes a similar phenomenon in her study of ESL learner responses to compliments by native speakers, pointing out that by limiting their responses to the use of stock phrases and not providing elaborations, the ESL learners thwarted attempts at conversation on the part of native speakers.

One kind of participant demonstration that the gaps are intended to prompt further talk by speaker A is found in the sequence running from lines 17 to 21. In line 17, A replies to M's question saying that he had "Japanese (0.8) nabe" for dinner. (The pause in A's reply, incidentally, most probably indicates a word search in progress—a doomed attempt to find an English equivalent for "nabe" which, like many ethnic food terms, has no direct translation.) At any rate, following a half-second gap M repeats (with falling pitch) "nabe," pauses for a further half-second, and then adds the news-receipt token "oh." It is worth noting that M does *not* say "Oh. Nabe." but rather "nabe (0.5) oh." Doing the receipt first might be interpreted as full acceptance of A's reply and provides for a slot where M might be expected to follow up this receipt with an evaluative comment (Heritage, 1984a). It is noteworthy that in this entire excerpt this is the only oh-receipt given. In contrast, by merely repeating "nabe" (more like a continuer than a news-receipt) and then pausing, M offers speaker A a further opportunity to expand on his "Japanese nabe" reply. Only when there is no expansion forthcoming does M offer the news-receipt token.

A gap of one full second then ensues after which speaker H comes into the talk (in line 21) with a one-word confirmation request ("nabe?"). Once again this can be seen as returning the floor to A for an expansion. The single laugh token may also be significant marking as it does "nabe" as a "laughable" and perhaps, therefore, worthy of further comment or discussion. Speaker A, however, simply confirms by repetition.

Moreover, speaker A's marginal responses appear to be responsible for the overall structuring of this talk as an "interrogation" in which one party is the target of all questioning. Beginning with his first marginal response in line 13, each subsequent question attempts to topicalize the prior question: *How about you? (Did you have dinner yet?) What kind of food did you eat? Nabe?Who did you have dinner with? How many are there? Four?* Both the overall structure and specific details of this stretch of talk appear to result directly from the marginal quality of A's replies to questions intended as conversational openers rather than from linguistic incompetence on the part of coparticipants.

This section has provided at least provisional support for the possibility that not all gaps in novice L2 talk are attributable to cognitive processing issues or language difficulties. On the contrary, the data presented here lend support to the hypothesis that at least some of the inter-turn gaps common to novice L2 talk are responsive to design features of prior speaker's turns. In the data examined here, inter-turn gaps were found to occur in the following sequential locations: (1) immediately subsequent to what have been termed haltingly produced turns (those containing numerous perturbations such as re-starts, pauses, irregular pacing); and

(2) immediately subsequent to unelaborated single word replies, marginally sufficient replies to questions intended as conversational openers. Given, however, the restricted data set under examination here, these findings must, for the time being—despite their intuitive appeal—be considered speculative. Future research employing a larger database of novice L2 talk would be required to substantiate (and expand on) these findings. Nevertheless, this discussion should highlight the danger of any research approach which would attempt to explicate gap behavior without detailed analysis of the interaction within which gaps emerge.

CONCLUSION

This paper began by asking whether novice L2 users are, in fact, capable of precisely timing their entry into talk, that is, whether they are able to project upcoming TRPs and thereby accomplish no-gap transitions. The answer appears to be a qualified "yes." The novice L2 speakers in this data regularly achieve no-gap transitions. In some cases these are *no-gap, no-overlap* transitions while at other times, for reasons unforeseeable to next speakers, they end up with overlapping start-ups at TRPs. We saw how this worked both within a single conversation and in the peculiar case of non-overlapping, parallel conversations. This paper also examined instances of recycled turn beginnings which demonstrate next speaker sensitivity to the importance of timing. In short, there is ample evidence that novice-level L2 speakers are, at least on occasion, capable of precisely timing their contributions to the flow of talk.

The reason for qualifying this result, however, is that the turns in my data are minimal, reflecting little syntactic complexity—along the lines of what a 2-3 year old "native speaker" child might produce. The range of skills required to project possible completion of such brief turns may be of a lower order than those needed to project endings of more complex turns. It remains to be empirically demonstrated whether novices are also capable of projecting the completion of complex, and potentially multi-unit, turns (Ford, forthcoming; Selting, 1998) of the sorts regularly seen in proficient user talk where next speakers must attend to a delicate matrix of syntactic, prosodic, pragmatic, gestural, *and rhetorical* resources. To this end, it might be informative to carry out careful conversation analytic descriptions of non-pedagogic talk between novices and, say, two proficient users in which the novice would find him/herself in competition for turns with the more advanced users.

It is often assumed that novice L2 speakers, and specifically those characterizable as "language students," are only grossly attuned to the language being addressed to them. Yet, this study suggests that this is not the case. In terms of their interaction, the novice L2 speakers in my data appear to orient to the same level of conversational detail as so-called "native speakers." Indeed, in some respects, the novice L2 interaction examined here sounds and looks very much like interaction among proficient users.

Nevertheless, there is no denying that some (though not all) of this talk is considerably "gappier" than proficient user talk and we, as analysts, need to account for this. Within mainstream linguistics, many, if not all, of these gaps have been written off as inevitable artifacts of faulty or limited linguistic competence. This paper has, to the contrary, sought to explore the possibility that at least some specific set of the inter-turn gaps in the data are not production disfluencies but rather represent selectively mobilized interactional resources employed by next speakers in response to turn-design features of prior speaker's turns.

One possibility that has been explored here is that gaps can be a way of dealing with the disfluent turn-production frequently found in novice L2 data. Specifically, if current speaker's turn is so broken and disfluent, for example, through the inclusion of numerous intra-turn pauses, that TRP projection becomes undependable, then next speakers may prefer to take a "wait and see" attitude instead of risking a start-up (in overlap) at an inappropriate place in the ongoing turn. Another avenue that has been briefly explored is that certain gaps may be occasioned by a prior speaker's *marginally sufficient* turn, for example an unelaborated "yes" or "no" to a question intended as a conversational opener. In these cases, it is not that next speaker is incapable of immediate start-up but rather that the speaker may be purposefully delaying participation in hopes of prompting the prior speaker to expand on what was said. While certainly not unique to novice talk, this pattern may be particularly prevalent in novice L2 talk (and possibly also novice-to-expert talk) due to the novice's more limited range of linguistic resources and, therefore, the predilection for minimal turns.

Whether as conversation analysts, language teachers, or others interested in second language use, we still have much to learn about the ways novices interact in an L2. One possible benefit of further investigation into novice L2 interactions (both novice-to-novice as well as novice-to-expert) might be a dramatic shift in how we view L2 learners. In a recent introduction to the foundations and practices of conversation analysis, Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) state:

> Conversation analysts have described the social organization of a wide range of *everyday* conversational phenomena. Consequently, there has been a tendency to focus on interactions between people with normal speech capacities. In the past few years, however, there has been a growing interest in the use of conversation analysis to investigate the interactional capabilities of people who, for physiological or psychological reasons, have speech difficulties. (p. 252)

Hutchby and Wooffitt go on to say that:

> Conversation analytic research emphasizes the subtle and sophisticated range of skills which people with speech problems nevertheless employ in their interaction with others: a range of competencies which might be lost to an analysis

motivated by, and embodying the assumptions of, a model of the speaker as intrinsically deficient. (p. 252)

Although Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) are referring to interactants who have physiological or psychological speech difficulties, what they have to say applies equally to second language learners. Overwhelmingly, language learners are modeled in the research as "deficient" speakers—in terms of both their linguistic skills and interactional abilities. Interestingly, children learning to interact in their first language are, in contrast, rarely portrayed as deficient or faulty speakers. The fact remains that, despite limited linguistic resources, even the humble novice L2 speakers in my data are, by-and-large, successful in their attempts to interact socially with coparticipants, and together they display a range of highly sophisticated interactional skills. The more thoroughly we understand the communicative skills these novices *do* have, as well as the dependencies and relationships these skills have with linguistic patterns of action, the more capable we will be of building on those skills.

APPENDIX A – TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

The transcripts presented in this paper conform to the transcription standards attributed to Gail Jefferson as outlined in Atkinson and Heritage (1984). All timings were measured to the closest .001 of a second using sound editing software and then rounded off to the closest tenth of a second (see Endnote 16). Micro-pauses of less than 0.2 second are transcribed as (.).

In transcribing the novice L2 talk presented in this paper, I attempted as close a transcription as possible. For example, if the pronunciation of a word was aberrant, I tried to reflect this in the transcript, for example, "sink" for "think" and "white-o" for "white." Japanese students of English often speak in what one might call "kana-speech," in other words, English spoken as if written in the Japanese hiragana/katakana syllabary. Such speech is characterized by the addition of vowels to final consonants, for example "white-o," "drink-u," "and-o," etc. While traditionally thought of as a pronunciation problem, there are several instances in my data which suggest the possibility that kana-speech is, at least on occasion and by particular participants, strategically employed. For this reason, rather than to stigmatize or stereotype pronunciation patterns, I have attempted to include these word-final vowel additions whenever I could discern them.

Specific Features of Japanese Talk (often inserted into English talk):

.hss	a hissing inbreath similar in use to "we::ll::"
un (n)	akin to "yeah," this conversational object has several meanings depending on sequential location, for example, news receipt, "yes" response to question, and continuer.
ha' ha' ha'	similar to "oh oh oh"—an emphatic marker of comprehension
ohn	a nasalized /o/ sound often used as a news receipt
so	Japanese speakers frequently begin turns with "so" which is not the causal or concluding "so" of English. The Japanese "so" can function as a news receipt similar to "yeah."

APPENDIX B – TOEIC TEST SCORES

At the beginning of the semester during which these recordings were made, all second year students were required to take the TOEIC exam. While this exam, like the more difficult TOEFL, is not designed to test communicative ability, these scores do offer some insight into the objective levels of the participants' English.

Student	Listening	Reading	Total
M's group			
(S)	130	100	230
(K)	215	145	360
(M)	170	140	310
J's group			
(J)	390	315	705
(M)	215	150	365
(A)	205	165	370
(H)	240	120	360

NOTES

[1] This paper follows the conversation analytic practice established in Sacks et al. (1974) of using the terms "current speaker" and "next speaker" without determiners. This is intended to remind readers that these terms reflect structurally differentiated roles within the model of conversational turn-taking described by Sacks et al. (1974) rather than mere common-sense, temporal descriptions of who happens to be talking at some given moment. This usage, furthermore, highlights the conversational reality that both current speaker as well as (all possible) next speakers are involved in the interactive process of creating the turn-in-progress (Goodwin, 1979, 1981).

[2] Throughout this paper the terms "gap" and "pause" will be used in the technical senses suggested by Sacks et al. (1974) in their footnote on page 715. According to Sacks et al. (1974), pauses are turn-internal silences, in other words, intra-turn pauses. Gaps are silences that occur between speaking turns, in other words, inter-turn gaps. Sacks et al. (1974) also refer to "lapses" which may represent a longer, temporary suspension of talk.

[3] For full discussions of the "myth of the native speaker" see Coulmas (1981), Paikeday (1985), and Davies (1991). Paikeday prefers the term "proficient user" to "native speaker." The term NS itself occurs relatively infrequently in CA literature where it has been subsumed under talk of "membership in a speech community" or "communicative competence."

[4] We might also consider whether the NS/NNS device is deployed, in many settings, as what Sacks called a *cover* (Sacks, 1992, p. 317 [Spring, 1966, lecture 6]) for a deeper-level omni-relevant device such as "native/foreigner." Where the participants are from visually similar ethnic groupings, the salience of NNS-ship may be much less pronounced than in situations in which participants are often on the basis of their "race" alone, even prior to spoken interaction, assigned the role of NNS regardless of their linguistic competencies. In these situations it seems clear that it is the omni-relevance of racial/ethnic devices that are most important and that the NS/NNS categorization might be merely, in Sacks' words, a "polite" cover.

[5] Used with permission of the author. LANG-USE is an e-mail discussion group focusing on aspects of language as it is used in society. Another e-mail list with an even tighter focus on conversation analysis (and ethnomethodology) is ETHNO. Subscription information on both is available at Paul ten Have's excellent site ETHNO-CA NEWS at http:www.pscw.uva.nl/emca/index.htm

[6] I am excluding here the large body of conversation analysis research looking at NS/NNS interaction in what might be called "pedagogic talk" (Koshik, 1999; McHoul, 1990; Seedhouse, 1996).

[7] In the case of J's group, four were allowed to avoid placing one male in an female group. The

rationale behind using triads instead of dyads or groupings of four or more is that triads allow for a more interesting display of turn-taking strategies than in dyads while at the same time excluding the possibility of one conversation schisming into multiple conversations (Egbert, 1997).

[8] The Hi8 camcorder was mounted on a tripod and placed about 2m away from the low table around which the participants were seated. A wide-angle lens attachment was used to allow the participants greater freedom of movement while still remaining in the frame.

[9] Senko Maynard (1989) maintains that supportive overlap is more common in Japanese conversational interaction than in English conversation. She states: "…in Japanese casual conversation, overlap may function to show the listener's enthusiasm, understanding and involvement" (p. 157). Laughter has also been shown to function as an affiliating device in English conversation (Jefferson, Sacks & Schegloff, 1987). Japanese males, on the whole, are more stoic in public than are Japanese females. It has been my experience that talk by Japanese females contains much more laughter (and overlap and clapping) than male talk (in Japanese as well as English).

[10] Many newcomers to CA as well as scholars outside of CA have misunderstood the essential nature of TRPs, imagining them to be "pauses" between turns. This fundamental miscomprehension has even been expressed by such eminent scholars as Searle (1991, p. 18) who in criticizing the Sacks et al. (1974) speaker selection rules says "Next speaker self-selects. That just means that there is a break and somebody else starts talking." Although, to be fair, in a later reply to Schegloff's response (also in Searle) Searle adds "...by 'break' or 'pause' I did not mean a simple temporal gap, but rather the boundaries of an intentionally defined chunk" (Searle, p. 146).

[11] In their footnote on page 703, Sacks et al. (1974) state that "How projection of unit types is accomplished, so as to allow such 'no gap' starts by next speakers, is an important question on which linguists can make major contributions. Our characterization in the rules, and in the subsequent discussion, leaves open the matter of how projection is done.

[12] It is important to keep in mind that conversational silences *emerge* interactively—they are not *inserted* into talk. The terms "gap" and "pause" are after-the-fact analytic descriptions of what has already happened in a bit of transcript. According to orthodox usage of the terms "gap" and "pause," if when current speaker reaches a TRP there is no uptake and the same speaker starts another TCU, the silence between the TCUs is transformed into an "intra-turn pause." However, this blurs the important distinction between non-final pauses where speaker transfers are unlikely and "silences following a possible TRP."

[13] It might be argued that these "gaps" might not be gaps at all, but might, in reality, have been filled with some non-verbal action/response. Certainly this would have to be considered in the analysis of face-to-face interaction. However, much of the earliest work on preference organization by Sacks and others is based on telephone conversations and, therefore, this is not an issue. Excerpts 6 and 7 come from Sacks' corpus of telephone conversations.

[14] For useful introductions to *adjacency pair organization* see Levinson (1983); Heritage (1984b, chapter 8).

[15] Tanaka (forthcoming) suggests that, in her Japanese data, participants seem to orient to the existence of "acknowledgement relevance places" as well as TRPs and that one discourse function of the Japanese particle "ne" (in turn-internal position) is to signal upcoming acknowledgement relevance places. Ford and Thompson (1996, p. 151) discuss what they call "local" (vs. "global") pragmatic completion (also see Schegloff, 1982) and Houtkoop and Mazeland (1985) cover similar ground under the rubric of "open" versus "closed" discourse units. Selting suggests that we may need to distinguish "between TCUs that do not and that do end in TRPs" (1998, p. 3).

[16] Salla Kurhila of the University of Finland, working with non-pedagogic NS-NNS interactions (in Finnish) demonstrates that NSs often use repetition in next position to repair grammatical errors in nonintrusive ways, in other words, in ways that do not make the NNS identity conversationally salient (Kurhila, forthcoming).

[17] All timings of conversational silences in my transcripts were done using sound editing software (see Carroll, 1999). In the original transcripts I recorded timings to the closest .01 by carefully examining the waveform. However, in an effort to conform to conversation analysis transcription standard, I have, in this paper, rounded times to the closest tenth. In my paper on software-based timing, I argue that neither beat-based nor stopwatch-based timings are truly accurate to the "closest one-tenth" which has

become the *de facto* standard in conversation analysis work. Silences of less than 0.2 seconds, so-called "micro-pauses," are transcribed as (.).

Many prominent conversation analysts, among them Schegloff and Psathas, reject the idea of "mechanical" timing (which one would assume includes both the use of software as well as stopwatch) in favor of relativistic beat-based, "pace-sensitive" timing. They argue that mechanical timings do not reflect a participant's hearing of a conversational silence, in other words, in slowly paced talk a silence of 0.4 seconds might have a very different sort of impact than the same silence in fast talk. In principle, I agree entirely. Nevertheless, particularly with novice L2 data where the pace of the talk can be extremely erratic and varies greatly from participant to participant, I feel it is simply impractical to do pace-sensitive timings.

[18] The novice L2 speakers in my data vary dramatically in the prosodic features of the turns they produce. At times these features differ dramatically from so-called native speaker talk. As such it is occasionally difficult to draw firm analytic conclusions regarding intonational completeness. For instance, while speakers often use sharply rising or falling pitch to signal completion, there are many other cases, as in excerpt 24, where the pitch variance over the entire turn is minimal, in other words, that talk has a monotone quality. In these cases, syntax may become the dominant clue for TRP projection.

[19] Within conversation analytic work, laughter is treated as a highly organized and carefully timed activity. See Jefferson, Sacks and Schegloff (1987).

[20] This highlights one of the problems of analyzing novice L2 talk (both for participants and professional analysts). While participants in proficient user talk can assume more or less full linguistic competency on the part of their coparticipants, novice L2 next speakers must frequently evaluate the completeness of turns containing syntactic and/or prosodic errors. Next speakers are thus faced with the additional task of mapping what the current speaker is saying onto some possibly "correct" utterance. This is certainly one aspect of novice L2 talk that requires further empirical study.

[21] A type of sponge cake popular in Japan.

[22] Schegloff (2000) states "What exactly constitutes a 'beat' is not yet well understood. For present purposes I will treat it as substantially equivalent to a 'syllable,' but this is essentially a convenient stipulation, to be replaced when careful empirical analysis specifies more robust units to which simultaneous speakers can be shown to be oriented" (p. 19). Schegloff's caution against equating what he calls a "beat" with the traditional linguistic unit "syllable" seems merited in this case. M's talk-in-overlap is easily divisible into 4 clear syllables. On the other hand, S's talk-in-overlap ("and") would, in any traditional sense, be understood as having only one syllable; so any "syllable-by-syllable" approach to the analysis becomes problematic. It might, however, be possible to side-step this problem by introducing the Japanese linguistic concept of the "mora" which is claimed to be a time-based (rather than stress-based) phonetic unit (see Vance, 1987 for a discussion of "mora"). A word like "kekkon" ("wedding") is said to consist of 4 mora each occupying roughly the same amount of time/space which can be represented as ke/k/ko/n. While some linguists question whether there is an phonetic reality underlying "mora," there seems to be no doubt that the unit is at least "psychologically real" for Japanese speakers in that when asked they will regularly segment words into mora rather than syllables.

[23] Several cross-cultural researchers (Maynard, 1997; Philips, 1976; Scollon, 1985) have argued that the "pressure to take a turn" resulting from the so-called "pressure rule 1b" (Sacks et al., 1974, p. 719) is a "Western" cultural trait. They claim that in other cultures, for example, Native American cultures and in Japan, people do not compete for turns with the same vigor, and that pausing, in other words, silence, is not universally seen negatively. Scollon (1985, p. 26), referring to the metaphor that "American speech is a machine," sums up what he and others claim as Western bias saying: "If one assumes the engine should be running, then silence will indicate failures. Smooth talk is taken as the natural state of the smoothly running cognitive and interactional machine."

Agar (1994) reviewing research by Scollon and Scollon (1981), states "Athabaskans allow a slightly longer pause than Anglos do, maybe a half a second or so, but enough to make a difference. The results—an Athabaskan will wait patiently for the speaker to continue when an Anglo has already decided that the speaker is finished" (p. 165).

While it has been my personal, subjective experience as an American living in Japan, Mexico and the Middle East that many cultures do, indeed, seem to have a greater cultural tolerance for "non-talk in the

presence of others," I, nevertheless, take the universalist position that the Sacks et al. (1974) turn-taking system is a suitable model for casual conversation in all cultures. Which is only to say that my experience leads me to believe that the basics of human social interaction are largely the same from culture to culture. But beyond my own personal beliefs on this matter, there is a growing body of conversation analysis research on non-Indoeuropean languages such as Thai (Moerman, 1988) and Japanese (Ford & Mori, 1994; Fox, Hayashi, & Jasperson, 1996; Furo, 1998; Hayashi, 1994; Hayashi & Mori, 1998; Tanaka, 1999) which generally confirms that participants from other cultures engaged in casual conversation orient to the same basic rules of turn-taking as do, say, Americans, British English speakers or Australians.

[24] Schegloff (1982) notes that current speakers frequently take strategic advantage of changes in pacing to maintain the speaking turn. Specifically, by speeding up the production of the final part of the TCU in progress (called a "speed-up" or "rush-through") current speakers are able to begin a new TCU, thereby reacquiring speaking rights, before other next speakers are prepared to come in.

[25] Speaker J tells me that M also speaks in this same hesitant, broken manner in Japanese. There is still much room and much need within conversation analysis for discussion of personal conversational style which might include consideration of, for example, historically conditioned or routinized usage (Philips, 1992).

[26] The stereotype of conversation as questions and answers is ubiquitously present in the written dialogues found in most published EFL materials, for example in the following dialogue taken from *Interchange* (Richards, 1990, p. 23).

Q	Liz:	Do you like jazz, Tom?
A - Q	Tom:	No, I don't like it very much. Do you?
A - Q	Liz:	It's OK. What kind of music do you like?
A	Tom:	Well, I like rock a lot.
Q	Liz:	What's your favorite group?
A - Q_1/Q_2	Tom:	U2. How about you? Do you like them?
A	Liz:	No, I don't. I can't stand them.

The primary agenda of such dialogues is, of course, not to model natural talk but rather to present the grammatical structures, for example, question formation, short answers, etc., to be dealt with in the unit. Notice also that negative responses to yes/no questions are formulated with the negating element occurring turn-initially—in stark contrast with the dispreferred turn shape described by both Sacks (1987) and Pomerantz (1984). Sacks observes that:

...there is an apparent interaction between the preference for contiguity and the preference for agreement, such that, if an agreeing answer occurs, it pretty damn well occurs continuously, whereas if a disagreeing answer occurs, it may well be pushed rather deep in to the turn that it occupies. (p. 58)

Sacks (1987, p. 58) provides the following example from his data:

A: Yuh coming down early?
B: Well, I got a lot of things to do before gettin' cleared=
=up tomorrow. I don't know. I w- probably won't be too early.

Speaker B in this example delays the actual doing of the dispreferred action (saying "no") until very late in the turn thus opening up the possibility that A will "get the point" earlier and, therefore, render the overt doing of the dispreferred action unnecessary.

[27] In her paper on the operation of short(er) multi-unit turns (i.e., turns composed of more than one TCU), Ford (forthcoming) outlines a conversational practice whereby "...turns initiated with negation—specifically, negation that expresses disaffiliation or disagreement with prior talk—regularly include a continuation beyond the turn-constructional unit containing the negation; that is, negation is followed by elaboration of some sort." Examples of this sort of turn are:

(1) Hey. (.) You don't have to worry about me, I had Listerine this morning.
(2) Not me:, hhuh uh-hhuh .hhh I go in late everyday.

What is interesting about these multi-unit "rhetorical combinations" is that they are hearably complete in terms of syntax, prosody and pragmatic content after the first TCU but they nevertheless manage to adumbrate further talk. Recipients regularly display a lack of uptake at the completion of the first element of such rhetorical combinations. Furthermore, according to Ford, recipients of unelaborated negatives regularly treat such talk as problematic or, at the very least, as requiring some alteration in the talk's trajectory.

[28] See Richards (1977) for a study comparing answers in naturally occurring data to yes/no questions with the sorts of answers found in EFL materials.

REFERENCES

Agar, M. (1994). *Language shock: Understanding the culture of conversation.* New York: William Morrow.

Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual conversation.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Auer, P. (Ed.). (1998). *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity.* London: Routledge.

Baker, C. (1996). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Beach, W. (1996). *Conversations about illness: Family preoccupations with bulimia.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Carroll, D. (1999). On the precision timing of conversational pauses with computer software. *ETHNO/CA NEWS*: http://www.pscw.uva.nl/emca/TIMING-e.htm

Coulmas, F. (Ed.). (1981). *A festschrift for the native speaker.* The Hague: Mouton.

Couper-Kuhlen, E. (1993). *English speech rhythm: Form and function in everyday verbal interaction.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Couper-Kuhlen, E., & Selting, M. (Eds.). (1996). *Prosody in conversation. Studies in interactional sociolinguistics 12.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davidson, J. (1984). Subsequent versions of invitations, offers, requests, and proposals dealing with potential or actual rejection. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 102-128). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press..

Davies, A. (1991). *The native speaker in applied linguistics.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Davies, A. (1994). Native speaker. In R. E. Asher & J. M. Y. Simpson (Eds.), *The encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (Vol. 5, pp. 2719-2725). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Egbert, M. M. (1997). Schisming: The collaborative transformation from a single conversation to multiple conversations. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 30,* 1-51.

Fetzer, A. (1997). Konversationsanalyse und Konversations-unterricht. Zeitschrift für Interkulturellen Fremdsprachenunterricht, Jahrgang 2, Nummer 1, Mai 1997. Available: www.ualberta.ca/~german/ejournal/fetzer.htm

Firth, A. (1995). Multiple mode, single activity: "Telenegotiating" as a social accomplishment. In P. ten Have & G. Psathas (Eds.), *Situated order: Studies in the social organization of talk and embodied activities* (pp. 151-172). Washington, D.C.: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal, 81*, 285-300.

Ford, C. (in press). At the intersection of turn and sequence: Negation and what comes next. In E. Couper-Kuhlen & M. Selting (Eds.), *Interactional linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Ford, C., & Thompson, S. (1996). Interactional units in conversation: Syntactic, intonational, and pragmatics resources for the management of turns. In E. Ochs, E. Schegloff, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 134-184). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ford, C., Fox, B., & Thompson, S. (1996). Practices in the construction of turns: The "TCU" revisited. *Pragmatics, 6*, 427-454.

Ford, C., & Mori, J. (1994). Causal markers in Japanese and English conversations: A cross-linguistic study of interactional grammar. *Pragmatics, 4*, 31-61.

Fox, B. A., Hayashi, M., & Jasperson, R. (1996). Resources and repair: A cross-linguistic study of syntax and repair. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 185-237). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

French, P., & Local, J. (1983). Turn-competitive incomings. *Journal of Pragmatics, 7*, 17-38.

Furo, H. (1998). Turn-taking in Japanese conversation: Grammar, intonation, and pragmatics. In N. Akatsuka, H. Hoji, S. Iwasaki, & S. Strauss (Eds.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics,* (Vol. 7, pp. 41-57). Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Goodwin, C. (1979). The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 97-121). New York: Irvington.

Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers*. New York: Academic Press.

Goodwin. C., & Goodwin, M. (1987). Concurrent operations on talk: Notes on the interactional organization of assessments. *IPrA Papers in Pragmatics, 1*, 1-52.

Hamers, J., & Blanc, M. (1989). *Bilinguality and bilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hayashi, M. (1994). A comparative study of self-repair in English and Japanese conversation. In N. Akatsuka (Ed.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, (Vol 4, pp. 77-93). Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Hayashi, M. & Mori, J. (1998). Co-construction in Japanese revisited: We do finish each others sentences. In N. Akatsuka, H. Hoji, S. Iwasaki, & S. Strauss (Eds.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics*, (Vol. 7, pp. 77-93). Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Heritage, J. M. (1984a). A change-of-state token and aspects of its sequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299-345). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. M. (1984b). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hopper, R. (1992). *Telephone conversation*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Houtkoop, H., & Mazeland, H. (1985). Turns and discourse units in everyday conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 9*, 595-619.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis: Principles, practices and applications*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jefferson, G. (1973). A case of precision timing in ordinary conversation: Overlapped tag-positioned address terms in closing sequences. *Semiotica, 9*, 47-96.

Jefferson, G. (1986). Notes on 'latency' in overlap onset. *Human Studies, 9*, 153-83.

Jefferson, G. (1987). Preliminary notes on a possible metric which provides for a standard maximum silence of approximately one second in conversation. In D. Roger & P. Bull (Eds.), *Conversation: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 166-196). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Jefferson, G. (1990). List construction as a task and interactional resource. In G. Psathas (Ed.), *Interactional competence* (pp. 63-92). Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.

Jefferson, G., Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Notes on laughter in the pursuit of intimacy. In G. Button, J. R. E. Lee, (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation* (pp. 152-205). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters:

Jefferson, G., & Schegloff, E. A. (1975). Sketch: Some orderly aspects of overlap in natural conversation. Paper presented at the 74th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco, CA.

Koshik, I. (1999). Practices of pedagogy in ESL writing conferences: A conversation analytic study of turns and sequences that assist student revision. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of California, Los Angeles.

Kurhila, S. (in press). Correction in talk between native and non-native speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*.

Lerner, G. (1991). On the syntax of sentences-in-progress. *Language in Society, 20*, 441-458.

Lerner, G. (1996). On the "semi-permeable" character of grammatical units in conversation: Conditional entry into the turn space of another speaker. In E. Ochs, E. Schegloff, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 238-276). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Local, J. (1986). Patterns and problems in a study of Tyneside intonation. In C. Johns-Lewis (Ed.), *Intonation and discourse* (pp. 181-198). London: Croom Helm

Local, J., & Kelly, J. (1986). Projection and "silences": Notes on phonetic and conversational structure. *Human Studies, 9*, 185-204.

Maynard, S. (1989). *Japanese conversation: Self-contextualization through structure and interaction management*. Volume XXV in the series: *Advances in discourse processes*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Maynard, S. (1997). *Japanese communication: Language and thought in context*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.

McHoul, A. (1978). The organisation of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society, 19*, 183-213.

McHoul, A. (1990). The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in Society, 19*, 349-377.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Moerman, M. (1988). *Talking culture: Ethnography and conversation analysis*. Philadelphia, PA University of Pennsylvania Press.

Paikeday, T. M. (1985). *The native speaker is dead!* Toronto: Paikeday.

Philips, S. (1976). Some sources of cultural variability in the regulation of talk. *Language in Society, 5*, 81-95.

Philips, S. (1992). The routinization of repair in courtroom discourse. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon* (pp. 311-322). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessment: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.) *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57-101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. (1977). Answers to yes/no questions. *ELT Journal, 31.*

Richards, J. (1990). *Interchange 1: Student's Book.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H. (1987). On the preference for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button & J. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation* (pp. 54-69). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation*: Edited by G. Jefferson, introduction by E. Schegloff. Cambridge: MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turntaking in conversation. *Language, 50*, 696-735.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1978). A simplest systematics for the organization of turntaking in conversation. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 7-55). New York: Academic Press.

Schegloff, E. (1972). Notes on a conversational practice: Formulating place. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 75-119). New York: Free Press.

Schegloff, E. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of "uh huh" and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Georgetown University roundtable on languages and linguistics* (pp. 71-93). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Schegloff, E. (1987). Recycled turn beginnings: A precise repair mechanism in conversation's turn-taking organization. In G. Button & J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation* (pp. 70-85). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Schegloff, E. (1992). On talk and its institutional occasions. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work* (pp. 101-134). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. (1996). Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E. Schegloff, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 52-133). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. (2000). Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language in Society, 29*, 1-63.

Schlegel, J. (1998). Finding words, finding meanings: Collaborative learning and distributed cognition. In S. Hoyle & C. Temple Adger (Eds.) *Kids talk: Strategic language use in later childhood* (pp. 187-204). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Scollon, R. (1985). The machine stops: Silence in the metaphor of malfunction. In D. Tannen & M. Saville-Troike (Eds.), *Georgetown University roundtable on languages and linguistics 1981* (pp. 21-31). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (1981). *Narrative, literacy and face in interethnic communication.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Searle, J. (1991). Conversation. In John Searle et al. *(On) Searle on Conversation* (pp. 7-29). Amsterdam: Benjimins.

Seedhouse, P. (1996). *Learning talk: A study of the interactional organization of the L2 classroom from the conversation analysis institutional discourse perspective.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Department of Educational Studies, University of York.

Selting, M. (1996). On the interplay of syntax and prosody in the constitution of turn-constructional units and turns in conversation. *Pragmatics, 6,* 357-388.

Selting, M. (1998). *TCU's and TRP's: The construction of units in conversational talk.* http://www.ub.uni-konstanz.de/serials/couper.htm

Tanaka, H. (in press). The particle Ne as a turn-management device in Japanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics.*

Tanaka, H. (1999). *Turn-taking in Japanese conversation: A study in grammar in interaction.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Vance, T. (1987). *An introduction to Japanese phonology.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wagner, J. (Ed.), (1996). Conversation analysis of foreign language data. Special issue of *Journal of Pragmatics, 26,* (2) 145-259.

Wells, B., & Peppé, S. (1996). Ending up in Ulster: Prosody and turn-taking in English dialects. In E. Couper-Kuhlen & M. Selting (Eds.), *Prosody in Conversation* (pp. 101-130). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wolfson, N. (1989). The social dynamics of native and nonnative variation in complimenting behavior. In M. R. Eisenstein (Ed.), *The dynamics interlanguage: Empirical studies in second language variation* (pp. 219-236). New York, NY: Plenum.

Wong, J. (2000a). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/nonnative speaker English conversation. *Applied Linguistics, 21,* 274-297.

Wong, J. (2000b). The token 'yeah' in nonative speaker English conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 33,* 39-67.

Donald Carroll (BA, MA in linguistics from California State University, Fullerton) teaches intercultural communication, conversation analysis, applied linguistics and, inevitably, "conversation" at Shikoku Gakuin University in Japan. Currently he is working on a Ph.D. in conversation analysis at the University of York. Prior to coming to Japan, he taught EFL/EAP/ESP and linguistics in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Oman, and Mexico.

Reflections on Conversation Analysis and Nonnative Speaker Talk: An Interview with Emanuel A. Schegloff[1]

Jean Wong
The College of New Jersey

David Olsher
University of California, Los Angeles

Emanuel A. Schegloff is, along with Gail Jefferson and the late Harvey Sacks, one of the founders of conversation analysis, a mode of inquiry and research methodology. While he is most widely known for the foundational articles on turn taking (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974) and repair (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977) published in the journal *Language*, and the first published paper in conversation analysis (1968), Dr. Schegloff has published over 70 articles on talk and interaction, and continues to publish his ongoing research widely, including recent articles in the *American Journal of Sociology, Social Research, Language in Society, Discourse and Society, Discourse Processes, Research on Language and Social Interaction, Language and Speech, Discourse Studies, Aphasiology,* and *Applied Linguistics.* He co-edited the 1996 volume *Interaction and Grammar* with Elinor Ochs and Sandra Thompson and is currently writing a synthesis of work in conversation analysis that might also serve as a textbook for students. Dr. Schegloff is Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Los Angeles, where he has taught a course sequence on "Conversational Structures" on a regular basis for over twenty-five years. Through his teaching, data sessions he has organized, and his personal mentoring, Dr. Schegloff has been instrumental in training many of the practitioners of conversation analysis working today, including researchers working on a growing variety of languages (such as German, Finnish, Swedish, Japanese, Mandarin, and Korean).

Wong: *In its history of roughly thirty-five years, conversation analysis (henceforth CA) has moved from a focus on ordinary conversation to the inclusion of talk in institutional settings. But the CA tradition has been predominantly monolingual, focusing on native speaker talk-in-interaction. What are your thoughts, Manny, on why CA has not included the talk of nonnative speakers in its research program?*

Schegloff: Let me say something about the preface to the question. What you say is true and not true at the same time. When you look to see what sort of data Harvey Sacks and I first worked on, it was institutional data. I worked on

telephone calls to the police. Harvey worked on telephone calls to a suicide prevention center and then group therapy sessions. The issue isn't what kind of data anybody has worked on, but how one worked on it.   When I began looking at phone calls to the police, I was starting out with a particular kind of problem, and I kept getting driven back earlier and earlier in those calls, until I ended up with "Police desk, can I help you?" To deal with that I had to deal with the beginning of telephone conversations, and, subsequently, the beginning of conversations. So the fact that you have a certain kind of material does not dictate the terms of the analysis. It can, but it doesn't have to.   It's not that CA started out with ordinary conversation and then eventually developed an interest in institutional talk, but that at some point it became more pressing or more inviting to focus on those aspects of the talk that couldn't be adequately addressed without taking into account the constraints of the institutional context in which the talk was being conducted. So that's just to the preface.

Now I want to return to your question concerning why we always dealt with, as you put it, monolingual rather than nonnative speaker talk. I want to treat the question as odd because it ascribes to workers in the past a relevancy which was not theirs, but is that of the askers of the question—and not just you two, but the literature that you've called to my attention as well.[2] Nobody was concerned particularly to avoid nonnative speakers, even though it was a constraint in my pedagogy. Those of you who went through my course know that in the very first material that I asked students to collect to work on, I insisted on conversation involving adults and discouraged dealing with data involving children, nonnative speakers, and institutional settings, that is, when students are getting their initial exposure to CA. But in the larger research arena, there was no particular interest in avoiding anything of the sort. The question comes up from the point of view of people who work specifically on nonnative speakers, for example, those who work specifically in applied linguistics on problems of teaching and the acquisition of a second or foreign language, who, looking for succor, help, and support from the conversation analysis research literature, find it isn't there. So it may look like CA workers have overlooked or ignored nonnative talk, but ignoring it means you know it's there and you turn your head away. It just wasn't a relevant category distinction to begin with. I was never confronted particularly with such materials until you, Jean, brought along yours (Wong, 1994). Then I said okay, let's go to work on those. And now that this sort of material does come along more frequently, one question is: How does one work on it? From my point of view, anything that goes on in talk-in-interaction is fair game for us, and we need to ask: What does it require of us as analysts to figure out how to deal with it adequately? That's an open question. There may be some people who feel it will require big innovations, but until someone shows that, I'm skeptical.

Olsher: *But aren't there some fundamental issues with nonnative talk which may not be present or relevant when doing CA using native speaker talk? For example,*

there is the problem of competence in the language of the interaction. How might this special problem affect the work that a CA analyst can do when examining nonnative talk?

Schegloff: I'm not sure it affects it at all. Let me draw an analogy from another area. Many years ago when I first taught CA at Columbia University, I had a small undergraduate seminar in which we worked on data from a radio talk show, the Brad Crandall material. Now when we were working with that material, one sort of proposal that students would sometimes put forward as we were examining a segment is that "they're doing X because it's on the radio." People often said that when they couldn't figure out something more penetrating to say about the data. It was problematic because you could say that for just about anything. So I instituted a kind of constraint on proposing that line, and that was that one could only invoke that account when one could show in the data some reason for invoking it, that is, offer some affirmative analysis which turned on (and illuminated) something specific in the data. It wasn't just that one knew as a kind of contextual background that this was from a radio broadcast; one needed to show *in the data* evidence of an orientation *by the participants* to a broadcast audience. So I want to put the issue of not being a competent speaker in the same category. Once you've got someone who is a nonnative speaker of the language, you can argue that there are places where [their] competence isn't what a native speaker's competence would be, and invoke that as your analysis almost anyplace. I would like to apply the same constraint here. So if someone wants to argue that something is unique, idiosyncratic, and category-specific to some particular interaction (or episode or exchange in an interaction) by virtue of the fact that someone's linguistic competence is problematic, then they accept a burden of further argument which involves specifying what that competency problem is and laying out how, in particular, that is what is at issue in the particular segment of the data being examined. The point is that I don't see that there is anything, in principle, that has to be different from other work in CA.

Olsher: *That's a very interesting answer. I'd like to take a specific example in native speaker interaction. An inter-turn silence or gap between turns doesn't necessarily mean anything in particular, but, in context, inferences can be drawn, and that might be seen in a different light when nonnative speakers are involved.*

Schegloff: Absolutely. I think that is the right sort of example to offer back, and I think it's one of the major places where one could suspect there might be a modification made by the co-participants. It does not require any change in the whole analytic strategy of CA because it's exactly the sort of thing we have in mind by recipient design. I think it's precisely things like delays—especially ones like those you allude to, ones that otherwise might be understood as prefiguring disagreement or misalignment or things of that sort, which can perfectly well be written off

by either a native speaker talking to a nonnative speaker, or a nonnative speaker talking to another nonnative speaker, as reflecting greater "processing problems," or the like. I think that's entirely plausible. But it's one thing to have it as a vernacular intuition, and another to show in detail *how* it works, *where* it works, *that* it works, and so on.

The global question that we're talking about here is: Is there some major transformation in the practices of analysis that has to be introduced by virtue of presuppositions otherwise made by conversation analysts that aren't the case for this domain of participation, so that how you go about doing analysis has to be altogether different? I remain skeptical about that because I think notions like recipient design are a very formal kind of vehicle. It's open to whoever the recipient might be, whatever the categories or terms of recipient design might be, and whatever the aspects of the talk on which they're brought to bear might be.

So what would be involved here? Well, one thing would be to show that for the recipient, who you want to argue isn't interpreting the gap in the way it might otherwise be interpreted or analyzed, is oriented, among other relevancies, to the categorical membership of the speaker as a nonnative speaker. Now you have to be able to *show* that somehow, and that might involve showing how nonnative speakers are "doing being" nonnative speakers, thereby making relevant their categorical membership. The point is that they're both oriented to the fact that one of them isn't a native speaker. Once you've shown that, you want to examine the particular places that seem to invoke it. And maybe you want to have a kind of global relevance for certain sorts of events, for example, what we talk about as "overlong transition spaces," or even turn-internal pauses. For example, Gene Lerner (1999) talks about how "delicates" are often displayed by a little hesitation before the utterance is produced. If the speaker is a nonnative speaker and you can show the orientation to the fact that he or she is a nonnative speaker, it could be proposed that the common interpretive resource is neutralized, so that when someone who knows they're dealing with a nonnative speaker hears a silence, they figure it has to do with finding the right word or taking a moment longer to fully grasp a preceding turn, which is a different sort of an issue for a nonnative speaker. So silence could become, for example, a key resource for grounding a claim for the relevance of the categorical identity of the speaker as a "nonnative speaker."

Wong: *One of the hallmarks of CA research is its ability to get at members' practices in talk and social structure. In this regard, the analyst and the participants in the data examined are, more often than not, from the same group, culture, or language. Isn't there, then, a problem for a CA analyst when confronted with nonnative speaker data because the researcher and the participants in the data analyzed may not share a set of cultural practices or interactional resources?*

Schegloff: A couple of things are to be said here. First, I thoroughly embrace the premise of the question. I basically think that people ought to work on materials in

a language and culture that they're native members of, so that all the native intuitions, whatever those are, are mobilized. How it happens that people can get trained in a language that's not their own is quite opaque to me, almost a miracle. How it is that people come to UCLA knowing the English that they do from Japan, Taiwan, Korea, Finland, Sweden, Germany, etc., and somehow, using American English materials, learn how to do CA analysis, and then take it back and do it on Swedish, Finnish, or Korean materials, I don't understand. But it happens, and it seems that's the ideal way. Ideally, people work on their own language and culture. Okay, but we can't always have the ideal, or have it in all respects. I just think we ought to have it where we can have it and as much as we can have it.

But what about where we can't have it? I don't think it's as hopeless as the premises of the question suggest. One basis for this is my own experience in working with people who are working with materials to which I have no direct access at all. Several instances come to mind, but I'll just mention one of them here. It involved a student from Korea with whom I was working on Korean material. Now I don't know any Korean, and I know virtually nothing about Korean culture, kinship and so on. We were working over some fragment of conversation, and I heard myself asking the following question, and I had no idea where it came from because I don't know anything about the culture of this society. I asked the student: Is it the case that there is kind of a position in Korean society where you have an older brother who isn't actually a blood relative, but plays the role of older brother? He said "Yeah." Well it came out of the data! It turned out that I didn't have to know that about Korean society in order to recognize it in the data. The way the talk was going just suggested that there would be such a person, or, as sociology and anthropology refer to it, such a role in the structure of the family. But I needed the student's knowledge to confirm the viability of the observation.

So it seems to me that, if we understand how interaction works, it's not that you've got to know in advance about the culture and the language in order to be able to get at the interaction, although in many instances you have to. The point is that you're not without resources. The implication of the question is that analysts can't do anything. Well, the techniques we have access to allow you often to make a pretty good guess about what's going on, and tell you where else to look if you don't have a member of the culture standing by as co-analyst confirming.

Wong: *Firth (1996) refers to two features of lingua franca talk in the form of two maxims, one being 'let it pass' and another being 'make the other's abnormal talk appear normal.' These rules or maxims are hard to get at using a CA framework because of the constraint that if interactants do not orient to a problem and let it pass, then the analyst doesn't deal with the problem and lets it pass as well. But certainly these practices of conversation appear to be somewhat different in native-nonnative talk than they are in native-native talk. We do seem to hold native speakers to a different standard than we do nonnative speakers when it comes to producing correct or acceptable speech. How can CA deal with these practices of*

native-nonnative conversation, namely, 'let it pass' and 'make it normal,' since they seem to run counter to the notion of procedural relevance[3] (Schegloff, 1991) yet they seem to make sense on an intuitive level?

Schegloff: I disagree with the premise. First of all, Firth (1996) attributes the notion of 'let it pass' to Cicourel by way of Schütz or Garfinkel. Garfinkel may have had it from Schütz as well. But they weren't consulting nonnative conversation, social life, or phenomenology in proposing that as a practice of mundane discourse; they were consulting ordinary discourse. So I think that, though Firth may want to put a particular twist on the notion of 'let it pass' for native-nonnative or nonnative–nonnative discourse, it may be misguided to say that it is distinctive to such discourse. And there are some fairly obvious places, I think, where this comes out. You'll find, for example, in some story-tellings, and in other types of turn which are projected to be extended or "multi-unit," that one of the things that interpolated 'uh huh's do is to pass an opportunity to initiate repair (Schegloff, 1982). Now sometimes when people pass an opportunity to initiate repair, it's because they don't have any problem with the preceding talk, and therefore there's nothing to initiate repair on, so nothing has been foregone in passing the opportunity. But there are other instances in which there *is* a problem, but what people do is let it pass—for now. It's not 'let it pass;' it's 'let it pass *for now*,' in the hope, expectation, or in allowing for the possibility, that things said subsequently will clarify the problem and avoid the need to initiate repair, and if they don't, then you can ask later on when it's next relevant. So that's a version of 'let it pass,' and it informs lots of ordinary talk among native speakers. Now it obviously may have a very special application where someone is not talking well or clearly.

There's another place where we see it clearly in native-native talk. If you remember early in the self-correction paper (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977), we made the point about replacing the notion of 'error' with 'trouble-source' and the notion of 'correction' with 'repair' and 'repair initiation.' One of the reasons was that there are some things that are clearly 'errors' which do not have repair initiated on them. And those are all instances of 'let it pass.' You may remember the data fragment in which an "Avon lady" says (Schegloff et al., 1977, p. 363), "And for ninety-nine cents uh especially in, Rapture, and the Au Coeur which is the newest fragrances, uh that is a very good value," to which the customer responds with "Uh huh," thereby "letting pass" a non-agreement between singular verb and plural subject. You just don't find very many grammatical corrections with native-native talk. Even when there are grammatical 'errors,' recipients let them pass.

Still, the question was "What do you do about it?" If the constraint is that you have to show relevance to the parties in order to have it as a real thing, and the parties "let it pass" and thereby apparently do *not* display its relevance, what do you do about it? Nothing I've said has addressed the problem; I've just been suggesting that it is not distinctive to non-native talk, even if it may arise there in

aggravated form.

Actually, I think several issues are involved here. The first question is: What sort of result is wanted? Do you want to end up with compelling, warrantable analyses of particular, singular episodes of interaction? Or is the goal to end up with accounts of *practices* of conversation, of *recurrent phenomena* in conversation, across diverse episodes, participants, settings, etc.? If what you want to end up with is essentially a clinical result, in the sense of a definitive account of something "anomalous" in a single case, I think there can always be some principled doubt with the analysis of a particular stretch of interaction. I used to refer to this (before the disappearance of the Soviet Union) as the KGB problem: "What if these people mean X by Y?" (e.g., "Hello" means "The submarines leave at midnight"). Well, you can't ever show it's not the case that the parties to some interaction are using the words or constructions in some distinctive way or private language; in the long run, you always have to be agnostic about any analysis as to whether that was for those people at that moment exactly how they understood what went on in that exchange. That's a real problem for people who have an applied discipline and who need to have a compelling individual diagnosis for each case.

But if the goal of inquiry is the establishment and elucidation of recurrent phenomena and the practices by which they are produced, then work will be grounded in collections of single instances, and collections provide a different sort of resource for addressing the problem of relevance. A *collection* of extracts can display the way persons (or persons in a certain sequential or interactional context, or persons doing some activity) do some action. Suppose that you find a particular episode in which someone has done it differently and the interlocutor(s) "let(s) it pass." But how can you say that they "let it pass" ? The question is: How can you *analytically, defensibly* claim that there was an "it," if that claim cannot be grounded in the displayed orientation of the recipient(s)?

One way is to lift the level of analysis from definitive explication of a single fragment to the fragment set in the context of certain practices in interaction. So if you can show the way that that type of action is ordinarily done, and you have some empirically grounded account of it, and a speaker has departed from that practice in some interactional episode with no observable consequence in the conduct of interlocutors, then you can proceed in the following way: You can return to your data base and see if you can find other such instances (in which case you have expanded your account of the practice); or you find other instances of that anomalous form of the practice in which there are consequences in the uptake by recipients; and maybe it's for a person from a particular source community, as in the data you've examined, Jean (Wong, 1994, 2000a), in which the participants are all native speakers of Mandarin, now speaking English, and when they do a certain thing, there's a practiced way of doing it, and this is a departure from it. Then that's the way you try to establish that there was some sort of problematic thing that was done (see Schegloff, 2000; Wong 2000a).

So the issue is: How do you show that something was problematic if you don't show the participant in some particular interaction orienting to its problematicity? And one way to do it is to have a collection of data in which you have a notion of a category or class of actions someone is doing, or practices or reference forms or whatever, and this instance departs from that, and that's your grounds for saying it's problematic. It's a departure from the practice used to do this action, and it's not picked up by others. (For more on this methodology, see Schegloff, 1996a.)

Olsher: *So one piece of advice we could get out of this is that if we're taking a conversation analytic approach, our analysis of the practices of any speakers should never rest solely on our intuition or on any prescriptive notion of what language should be. Our analysis should always be grounded in a body of data examined with the same analytic method.*

Schegloff: That's right. I mean surely you start with an intuition. Then the first question you ask yourself is: What is it in the data that made me think that it was doing such and such? Now the key phrase in that question is what *in the data,* because you can think of all sorts of elements in your own biographical experience that underlie that "intuition," for example, that you had an uncle who always did that. But, of course, that's totally irrelevant. Then the next question is: Is there any evidence that anybody other than you understands the talk in question in that way; most importantly, is there any evidence that the *recipient* understood it in that way? And another question is: Is there any evidence that this is something that is not idiosyncratic to that speaker? So now you look for other instances of that candidate phenomenon. Of course, you need to have an analytic account of what that phenomenon is, and look to see whether, in that description of it, you find other instances which also seem to be doing the same action or which seem to constitute the same phenomenon, and whether, wherever you find it, you find recipients understanding it in that way. If you have substantial evidence to that effect, you've got something. If you find instances that don't look like that in one respect or another and find that they nonetheless can be understood as instances of the same phenomenon or practice, you can start to broaden what actually serves to implement the action or the practice that you've been examining. And then you can try to take what you've learned from such a collection of instances, bring it to bear on particular instances, and see how the account works for a particular instance.

Wong: *What domains of inquiry would you consider of potential interest if you were to use CA in an explication of conversational structures of native-nonnative talk or nonnative-nonnative talk, and why those domains as opposed to any others?*

Schegloff: I plead innocent! I don't think I can speak to that.

Olsher: *Well, one caveat is that you're not completely unfamiliar with this domain of inquiry because you have advised at least two students I know, namely Jean [Wong] and Irene [Koshik], who have worked with some such data.*

Schegloff: That's very kind of you, but I treat native-nonnative discourse much as I treat a foreign language. I know what I consider relevant for me to be knowledgeable about a domain; it would be demeaning to Jean and Irene to claim that, on the basis of the exposure I got looking over their shoulders at their material, I'm knowledgeable about that domain (see Wong, 1994, 2000a, 2000b; Koshik, 1999).

But I'll answer the question anyhow, not on the basis of having any expertise in nonnative discourse, but because I'm going to answer it without naming any domains of principled special interest, because I don't think there *are* any *a priori* things that people ought to look at. I think the most productive way to work is to take your data and try to make observations just as you would with native-native speaker talk. I don't think there's anything different. As I said at the end of the paper that's going to be published with yours, Jean, in *Applied Linguistics* (Schegloff, 2000; Wong, 2000a), nonnative talk is just a sub-area in the study of talk-in-interaction. I think you work on it in the same way. You get the materials, you transcribe them, that gets you as intimate as you'll ever get with the materials when you're attentive to them in that way. You make observations about what you are examining even if you have no idea what significance or further thinking it will set off, if any. You write them all down. You see some things start to pop up recurrently; you notice something happening over and over again.

In fact, if I were to answer the question in the terms in which it was asked, I would be discouraging discovery, because I would be encouraging people to see in the data only things that were already known. They would have to be already known for me to mention them as domains of interest. But the big payoffs are always when somebody notices something and it *doesn't* have any name. People are sometimes disinclined to work on such things because they don't have a place in the map of CA topics that they've read about. But that, of course, is the hallmark of a discovery—that it's something that was not otherwise known. So the point is, again, a methodological or procedural one. You sit down; you make observations; you try to describe them as carefully as you can. You keep on doing that, and you keep on doing that. And you keep on doing that, and then hopefully you start to find, "Oh I've seen something like that before!" And you find the prior thing(s) you were put in mind of, and yes, sometimes they do look like the same thing, and sometimes they don't. You get some embryonic notion of what that thing is, and you try to get more instances. You have no idea of where it's going to end up. You have no idea to begin with whether it's a little thing, whether it's a footnote to a bigger thing, or whether it's a big discovery. Or whether, in the end, it's nothing at all. You never know that in advance. That's why it takes guts. You have to be prepared to take a chance and to persist with it, and hope that it will turn into something that you can build a livelihood on. But to say in advance this or that is

the best thing to work on, even if I *knew* something about the domain, it would be counterproductive for me to say; how much more so when I don't know the domain.

Wong: *In native-nonnative speaker interaction, equal participation may be uncertain due to an unequal distribution of linguistic knowledge or language competence. There is even greater potential for talk to go awry, a greater risk for misunderstanding. Here I cite your recent work (Schegloff, 2000) and mine (Wong, 2000a) on delayed other-initiated repair. Does this imply that a generic component of conversation, namely, the organization of repair, might be differently constituted with respect to nonnative talk?*

Schegloff: No, I don't think that they're differently constituted. I think that the product of the papers that we're publishing together is, if anything, quite the contrary. There is still the same set of positions in which repair gets initiated. There's always the possibility that the implementing linguistic resources for doing repair work differ depending, as I once put it, on the linguistic inventory that society makes available for its participants (Schegloff, 1987). I don't think that the organization of repair is different in different languages, or at least I haven't seen any evidence that it is, even though it's true that, if you actually look at instances of repair, they will look different because various of the parts that comprise an episode of repair—such as how to do its initiation, how to do the repair proper, how to do its aftermath—those may differ depending on the linguistic inventory of the language being deployed by the speakers.

The case of the work on Quiché that I discussed briefly in that paper is instructive. As you know, in English the most common two forms used to initiate same turn self-repair are cutoffs and sound stretches. And in English cutoffs and sound stretches are not phonemic for the language. So they're available for other kinds of uses, like initiating repair. As it happens in Quiché, both *are* phonemic for the language; surprise of surprises, self-initiated repair is *not* initiated with cutoffs or sound stretches. Instead it seemed to be the case (based on limited fieldwork and data collection) that unusually long sound stretches, which are *not* phonemic in Quiché, were used for self-initiation of repair in same turn. A place for self-initiation of repair is not a place in this world other than by reference to CA's ways of parsing and characterizing the talk, and, of course, if we're right, the *participants'* parsing of one another's talk. But there *is* such a place, apparently, for the Quiché speakers of the Guatemalan Highlands, just as for the American speakers of English, even if what they put there is different (although doing the same job).

So what should we say that the organization of repair is the same or that it's different? Well, I want to say that it's the same—the structure of doing repair is the same. It involves an initiation, it involves the repair proper, it involves the way you come out of the repair back into the turn (in the case of same turn repair) and so on. And those issues and places are the same for Quiché speakers and English

speakers. The job of repair initiation is to alert the recipient that the next thing to come out of the speaker's mouth may or may not be more of what she or he has just been saying; that's the same job in both English and Quiché. But what you do with the resources of the Quiché language to accomplish that are very different from what you do in the English language, and that's because of what the Quiché language and English language have as their phonological and lexical resources.

So I don't think that the organization *of repair* is different. I mean I wouldn't stake my life on it; it could be different. But if we found someplace where it did appear to be different, that would just serve to pose the problem: How can we describe the organization of repair in a somewhat more formal and abstract way that yields all the instances we knew until that day, and the new one that someone came back from the field with, as alternative specifications? That is so even though the linguistic resources that are used to implement those structures and those practices may be different, and may be adapted to aspects of the host language, the host culture, or whatever.

Olsher: *In the study of nonnative discourse, attention often turns to language classrooms since this is not only the professional area of many who are interested in nonnative language use, but is also one of the main locations where students of foreign languages have the opportunity and need to use the language they are learning. Yet, as has been noted by Kasper (1997) and others, language classrooms offer a more limited range of interaction to nonnative speakers than they face in their target speaking contexts in the outside world. The institutional roles of teacher and student, along with their associated rights and obligations, are both constructed and reflected in the discourse. Does it seem practical or profitable to bring the tools of CA to the study of nonnative discourse in classroom contexts? What would be the potential value and problems with working on such data, including teacher-fronted classroom talk, one-to-one tutorials, small group work, role plays, problem-solving tasks, and the range of things that might occur?*

Schegloff: Once again I plead ignorance about the domain, but I do have a couple of responses. I think the problem with classroom talk isn't just that there are often pre-assigned roles of teacher and student because, as you said, a lot of what goes on there is that students are divided up into little clusters, and they are told to talk to each other. That's the problem—that they're told to talk to each other. It must be a nightmare for the students who are trying to learn English, because not only are they having trouble with the language itself, but they've been given an interactionally impossible task, which is to make talk when they have nothing to talk to one another about, or if they do have something to talk about, that's not where they want to talk about it, and not with these other people listening to them. It's a very difficult situation, so I don't think it's just a matter of the hierarchy between the teacher and the student and the instructional roles that differentiate them. I think Wagner (1998) is quite right in his article about "doing being a guinea pig." It's guinea

piggish sort of stuff in the sense that guinea pigs, when they're put in experimental mazes, although being given food, are induced to perform something that they wouldn't otherwise perform for their own good; that's the whole point of the enterprise. And that is a problem.

I also understand why professionals want to look at this setting because it's the site of their own professional practice. They want to do as well as they can, both for themselves and for their students. The setting in which they get a chance to do their job is the classroom, so they want to know more about their classroom. Just like surgeons are concerned about antiseptics, because that concerns their work place, and they know that if they didn't know about it, people would die from infections. It's reasonable to want to get as good a knowledge as is possible of the setting where you do your work so you can do it better.

Now there are two separate issues here. First, is talk in the classroom setting good talk in which to examine native-nonnative discourse or nonnative-nonnative discourse? My answer to that is no. I think that a lot of the concern in the applied linguistics literature that you called to my attention is warranted.[4] The talk that language learners are going to have to do when they're not in the hothouse of the classroom is situated in the real world where they have real things to do, and that's the talk that people ideally should be recording and studying if they want to understand what the real world problems are for those who are speaking a language that is not their native language. I understand that that's its own problematic distinction, but, leaving that aside, I think that those are the settings you need to get.

But now back to the classroom, because there are two sorts of things worth further comment. One is that it's an institutionally defined environment for a certain kind of discourse and interaction. It's the one in which the learning and the teaching, the official learning, the official pedagogy takes place. In that respect, of course, it's as worthy of study as any other institutional environment, and, given its "double payoffs," maybe a little bit more so for people who want to make their careers and lives serving this class of problems faced by nonnative speakers. I think it's subject to particular difficulties, not particular as compared to other classroom settings, but in particular as compared to other institutional settings. And that impacts differentially on different areas of inquiry that enter into CA work. One of them that is the most impacted is research on repair.

One of the hallmarks of repair is that whatever was in progress—a turn, a sequence through which some activity was being pursued, etc.—is put on hold temporarily in order to deal with some trouble or problem in speaking, hearing, or understanding the talk. When the ongoing activity is concerned with learning, explaining, understanding, problems in understanding, correcting, and the like, it can be quite difficult to keep distinct the "mainline" sequences of activity on the one hand, and problems of repair that arise in its course on the other hand. Such environments then pose very special kinds of problems in discerning where the mainline activity stops and repair issues arise. I don't think these problems are insoluble, but they underscore that problems of repair are very different kinds of problems

than people who wanted to work in that area may have had in mind to work on. Researchers may treat this distinction as a technical obstacle to their work, rather than what the work should be focused on. They may want to get over it as quickly as possible so that they can get on with their research, when that—the relationship between understanding the instructional material and understanding the talk involved in presenting and receiving it—may be at the heart of their research.

Wong: *I'd like to turn now to the notion of grammar. You have written about interaction and grammar and have looked at turn organization in this regard (Schegloff, 1996b). What thoughts come to mind with respect to issues concerning interaction and grammar when the context involves nonnative speakers or native-nonnative conversation?*

Schegloff: One product of the work on grammar and interaction (for example, that collected in Ochs, Schegloff, and Thompson, 1996) has been that grammar is a resource for accomplishing different actions and that things that one might not have thought mattered turn out to matter. For example, I tried to make this point (Schegloff, 1986) with the difference between 'Are you awake?' and 'Did I wake you?' Now someone who is still working at a basic understanding of how the grammar of some language works might stand in a very different relationship than a native or fluent speaker does to the use of the grammar, and of such alternative grammatical realizations of a "same question," as having more than grammatical import—as having *action* import in the interaction.

Firth (1996) talks about the fact that the "order at all points" premise, to use one of Sacks' formulations of it (or the other version which is that nothing in principle can be ruled out as being relevant) might serve one ill if one were looking at native-nonnative or nonnative-nonnative conversation. We've come back to that by way of this grammar question, and I think that there is a slight misunderstanding here, because it's not literally "order at *all* points." And it's not that everything hearable is a locus of order. It's that nothing in principle can be *dismissed* in advance as possibly being a locus of order. There are lots of things that are not a locus of order—that turn out not to be (or to have been) a locus of order. It's the job of the analyst to sort out which ones are and which ones are not. And it's an issue for an interlocutor to figure out which ones are and which ones are not. We always talk about the basic question for interactants, and, therefore, for the analyst, being "Why that now?"—for any 'that,' for any 'now,' and for any 'why.' The question is: Does everything have to lead to some interpretive consequence?

One of the things that the work on interaction and grammar has tried to do is to show that some things which might have been treated just as grammatical alternatives to each other are interactionally consequential, and that speakers deploy them differently and recipients often will get the point and understand them differently—in other words, that the particular grammatical realization is a 'that' in the 'why that now?' question. But not everything is, and it may well be that, when

dealing with a native speaker in conversation with a nonnative speaker, the grammar may be treated by the former as not a locus of order in the usual way among native or fluent speakers. And once one realizes that grammar is not a resource which this co-interactant competently commands, how much latitude a recipient has in blocking the usual interpretive process is also unclear. It may well be—and again it would have to be shown—that the grammatical choices are not grammatical choices in the same sense as they are for someone who's speaking with native fluency.

Wong: *Do you think that CA might benefit from expanding its research agenda to include native-nonnative talk and nonnative-nonnative talk, even if as a point of departure for understanding native speaker talk? For example, one might ask: What is "native" about our mother tongue and mother culture? What does it mean to be a native speaker as opposed to being a nonnative speaker? What does it mean to be a native speaker as opposed to being a fluent but nonnative speaker?*

Schegloff: In the terms in which you've asked the question, I really can't answer. Here again, I have a problem with the premise of the question. The problem is where the categories "nonnative speaker," "fluent speaker," and the like come from, and whether those are terms in which someone undertaking a piece of research would think of the work in the first instance. Well, one thing we could do to advance CA as a field is to do some work on native-nonnative talk. I wouldn't recommend that anybody take on a piece of work in those terms. If they have some reason to look at native-nonnative data, look at native-nonnative data. But don't look at it as "native-nonnative" unless you have to—that is, unless something in the data requires you to because those are the terms in which the participants are conducting themselves. It's no more transparently relevant that the parties be characterized as 'native' or 'nonnative' than it is that they be characterized by gender, by race, age, etc. And it's not the case that once it's been made relevant at the beginning of an interaction, it's therefore relevant for the duration. It could be relevant or it could not be relevant and, here again, the insistence on its relevance and on making those categories primary categories in thinking about the data, I think, is an imposition of the professional interests of the people who pick it to study because of its relevance to their professional commitments. I'm not putting down those professional commitments. I just want to bracket that that's the source, in the first instance, of characterizing the data in this way, and of asking the question whether that kind of work would benefit the field. I don't see any reason to think it would benefit the field any more than cross gender or same gender, cross race or same race, cross anything or same anything, right? I see no reason to privilege any of those other categories unless you can show why the materials make it relevant—that is, the parties are doing it.

Once you've got that to warrant the inquiry, then we'll find out if it is going to confer any distinctive benefits on the field. So this is not meant to be a discour-

agement; it's just meant to contribute to a kind of self-awareness about where this native-nonnative interest is coming from. There's nothing wrong with it as long as you're clear about it so you don't *insist it* into the data, so that you don't insist that the participants be as preoccupied with native/nonnative speakers as you are . . . unless *they* are. If they are, of course, you need to recognize that and trace out the consequences and the way it figures in the way they conduct the interaction. But that's because *they're* preoccupied with it or oriented to it, not because *you* are.

Nor do I think you should give up working on the data if it turns out they're not preoccupied with it or oriented to it, because then it would be a self-fulfilling prophecy. Applied linguists would only seriously examine data in which the parties were preoccupied with the fact that they were not native speakers. We would never learn about all the nonnative speakers who are *not* preoccupied with it and for whom it's a totally incidental thing about their interaction. If you're going to have a field that is concerned with nonnative speakers, one of the first things you would want to know is that in 65% of the cases or 25% or always or never, it really doesn't matter to them, or it matters but it doesn't actually affect how they do the interaction.

Olsher: *So you're really invoking the procedural relevance of the identity in the interaction. And you're also suggesting that the fact that the identity may not be procedurally relevant to the talk is something that probably should be of interest to people who are interested in describing nonnative talk.*

Schegloff: That's right. The reason why in my (1991) paper I discriminated between relevance and procedural consequentiality was that in many instances the identity will be relevant. But if you have to show how it's consequential for what they do in the talk, that's another story. The other way around is unlikely; if you can show it's consequential—that particular sorts of talk have consequences and they're not understood by the interlocutor as being related to the fact that this is a nonnative speaker of English—then the person could be in big trouble because it could be thought that they're just being ornery rather than that they just don't know any better. But I think both things are the issue and, no matter what interests you bring, you want as much as possible to cultivate the interests not because *you've* brought them, but because, having brought them, you can find them in what was already there.

Wong: *Have we left out anything with respect to CA and the analysis of native-nonnative talk on which you'd like to comment?*

Schegloff: Yes, one thing. I'm not discounting the usefulness of talking about the area in the way that we have, and there is really no alternative. But for some people who will read this, this will be the mainline activity—*talking* about it—and there's no more important alert than to warn people off of that. If that's what people get

out of reading this, it will be perhaps useful for their academic careers; it will be another "entry" that they can include in teaching a survey of "approaches." But I don't think of what we do in CA as an approach. Approaches are ways of getting on a freeway; they don't take you anyplace. The freeway takes you someplace; the approach just gets you onto it. And so all the talk about it and all the characterization of CA as compared to this or that are like waiting in the anteroom and talking about the experience you're going to have when you go into the theater or something like that. It's not until our colleagues actually engage with materials, and try to make sense of them, and understand how they're orderly, how they are organized, how they underlie and underwrite what people do with their social lives in interaction. Not until then will they have a clue of what we've been talking about for the last two hours. They'll think they have a clue, and that's what makes it more dangerous, because at least if they understood fully that they didn't have a clue, then they would be prompted to go on and to get into the thick of it, but often people think "that's it." To be able to give an account, to say what this or that scholar said, that is what it's all about. It may be what having an academic life (or one type of academic life) is all about. It's not what doing conversation analytic research is all about. I suppose that's self-evident, but too many self-evident things often escape notice. So my sermon is always, in the long run: It's doing the work that matters, not the talking about it, except if that happens to recruit people who do it. Then it was worthwhile.

NOTES

[1] The interview took place at the 85th Annual Convention of the National Communication Association held in Chicago, Illinois (November, 1999). Jean Wong was a student of Emanuel Schegloff. She completed a master's thesis, doctoral qualifying paper, and dissertation under his primary supervision at the University of California, Los Angeles. Her dissertation (1994; see bibliography) involved examination of features of the organization of repair using native/nonnative speaker English conversation. David Olsher is a doctoral student in Applied Linguistics at UCLA. His research interests include broadcast news interview talk and classroom discourse, conversation analysis, and functional linguistics. The copy editing assistance of Monica Link for this interview is gratefully acknowledged.

[2] Prior to this interview, Wong and Olsher provided Schegloff with a sampling of the literature in applied linguistics which has addressed the issue of using CA to further our understanding of concerns in second language acquisition. References provided included: Firth (1996), Firth & Wagner (1997),Wagner (1996, 1998), Seedhouse (1998), and Wong (2000a).

[3] By *procedural relevance,* we refer to Schegloff's (1991) discussion of how aspects of social structure, such as the interactional setting and participants, can be analyzably relevant to some aspect of talk and interaction. The term Schegloff uses is *procedural consequentiality,* and this choice of words is designed to emphasize a focus on what the participants observably orient to through their specific micro-interactional practices. Schegloff argues that if we want to claim that a participant's identity (e.g., as female, as a doctor, or as a nonnative speaker) is relevant to some discursive practice, then it is not enough that the characterization be true, not enough that the characterization mattered to the participants on the occasion. It must matter for the particular aspect of the interaction under consideration, Schegloff argues, and the analyst must be able to demonstrate that. "There is still the problem of *showing from the details of the talk or other conduct in the materials* that we are analyzing that those aspects of the scene [or identity] are what the *parties* are oriented to" (p. 53).

[4] See note 2.

REFERENCES

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics, 26,* 237-259.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal, 81,* 285-300.

Kasper, G. (1997). Can pragmatic competence be taught? University of Hawaii at Manoa: Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Koshik, I. (1999). *Practices of pedagogy in ESL writing conferences: A conversation analytic study of turns and sequences that assist student revision.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Lerner, G. (1999). The collaborative construction of delicate formulations. Paper presented at the 85th Annual Convention of the National Communication Association, Language and Social Interaction Division, Chicago, IL.

Ochs, E., Schegloff, E., & Thompson, S. (1996). *Interaction and grammar.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50,* 696-735.

Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist, 70,* 1075-1095.

Schegloff, E. A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of 'uh huh' and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics 1981: Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk* (pp. 71-93). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1986). The routine as achievement. *Human Studies, 9,* 111-151.

Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Between macro and micro: Contexts and other connections. In J. Alexander, B. Giesen, R. Munch & N. Smelser (Eds.), *The micro-macro link* (pp. 207-234). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1991). Reflections on talk and social structure. In D. Boden & D. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and social structure* (pp. 44-70). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996a). Confirming allusions: Toward an empirical account of action. *American Journal of Sociology, 102,* 161-216.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996b). Turn organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E. A.Schegloff, & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 52-133). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2000). When "others" initiate repair. *Applied Linguistics, 21,* 205-243.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53,* 361-382.

Seedhouse, P. (1998). CA and the analysis of foreign language interaction: A reply to Wagner. *Journal of Pragmatics, 30,* 85-102.

Wagner, J. (1996). Foreign language acquisition through interaction—A critical review of research on conversational adjustments. *Journal of Pragmatics, 26,* 215-235.

Wagner, J. (1998). On doing being a guinea pig—A response to Seedhouse. *Journal of Pragmatics, 30,* 103-113.

Wong, J. (1994). *A conversation analytic approach to the study of repair in native-nonnative speaker English conversation: The element 'yeah' in same-turn repair and delayed next turn repair initiation.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Wong, J. (2000a). Delayed next turn repair initiation in native/nonnative speaker English conversation. *Applied Linguistics, 21*, 244-267.

Wong, J. (2000b). The token 'yeah' in nonnative speaker English conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 33*, 39-67.

A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning by Peter Skehan.
Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998, 324 pp.

Reviewed by Emi Morita
University of California, Los Angeles

As various approaches to second language acquisition (SLA) pedagogy have
developed over the course of the last fifty years, advocates of particular approaches
have often attempted to justify their advocacy with appeals to theories current in
the fields of linguistics, psychology, and sociology. Likewise, Peter Skehan, in his
recently published *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*, argues for the
efficacy of task-based instruction in second language learning by invoking recent
research into the psycholinguistic and cognitive aspects of language learning, giv-
ing particular attention to the recent research into the mechanics of language "pro-
cessing." What is unique in Skehan's approach is its emphasis on the importance
of individuals' cognitive *differences*—a topic which has been generally neglected
by advocates of most other SLA methodologies and "normative" approaches.

In the first part of this book, Skehan describes what he considers to be the
cognitive bases for second language learning. Here, he addresses two of the cen-
tral concerns in second language development theory: First, how interlanguage
development occurs through comprehension and production, and second, at what
point in the second language acquisition process language learners begin to pro-
ductively *notice* target form. Skehan's review of the existing literature on these
topics is instructive in its own right: Krashen (1985), for example, argues that if a
student is exposed to a sufficient amount of comprehensible *input*, then naturally
second language learning takes place. Conversely, Swain's (1985) "output" hy-
pothesis argues that in the attempt to *compose* new utterances, acquisition of new
syntactic structures will most likely naturally occur. Additionally, proponents of
"negotiation of meaning" approaches to language learning (e.g., Long, 1985; Pica,
1994) suggest that engagement with conversational "moves" (such as collabora-
tive completions, clarification requests, and comprehension checks) makes target
language input more comprehensible and thus increases its potential usefulness as
output in interlanguage development.

In *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*, Skehan critically investi-
gates all of the above approaches and, finding them explanatorily inadequate, pro-
vides a totally different picture of the methods and the mechanisms of second
language acquisition and processing by arguing that in real-time communication,
meaning becomes the central focus and that learners rely heavily on memorized
language (bypassing rule-based analytical systems) in order to reduce their cogni-
tive processing costs.

Skehan suggests that theorists need to consider more than just the roles that lexical and memory-based language systems play in second language acquisition and processing. Toward this end, he proposes a "dual mode" of language learning and processing—one that is both "rule-based" *and* "exemplar-based" and which is critical for *all* aspects of second language processing. This dual-mode learning system assumes that both input and output processing must have access to both rules and exemplars.

The rule-based system is generative and restructurable. Access to this system leads to the development of a form-oriented system but incurs the costs of heavy processing burdens during ongoing language use. Conversely, the exemplar-based system is heavily based on redundant memory systems. Since this system does not require internal computation, its advantage is a marked increase in processing speed; for the same reason, however, it is less efficient in incorporating changes to the underlying system.

Using the dual mode hypothesis, Skehan posits three stages of information processing—input, central processing, and output—and argues that the finite limitation of attentional resources forces second language learners to select compensatory strategies peculiar to each stage. For example, a learner may tend to give priority to the extraction of "meaning" during the processing of input, and access the exemplar-based system to find semantic correspondences. During output processing, on the other hand, learners must negotiate a "trade-off" as they allocate their attentional resources between the three competing requirements of accuracy, complexity, and fluency. Here, for example, a learner may pay less attention to fluency and complexity when under communicational pressure and allocate the majority of attentional resources to the rule-based system in order to gain accuracy. The problem with such "trade-off" tendencies is obvious: what the second language learner really wants is what the native speaker possesses naturally—that is, a seamless balance between accuracy, fluency *and* complexity.

In the second part of *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*, Skehan suggests task-based instruction as a solution to this problem. Citing results of his experiments and those done by his colleagues, Skehan argues that both task and instruction influence and provoke different cognitive strategies. He argues that tasks should be designed in such a way that the learners are forced to variously employ *all* their processing strategies—accuracy, fluency, and complexity—which are competing with each other due to limited attentional resources during language production and which should each be exploited in the effort toward a balance of production. The five principles for task-based instruction that Skehan proposes are the following:

1. Choose a range of target structures.
2. Choose tasks that meet the utility criterion.
3. Select and sequence tasks to achieve balanced goal development.
4. Maximize the chances of focus on form through attentional manipulation.
5. Use cycles of accountability. (p. 129)

Skehan argues that by carefully controlling the different facets of the task (such as number of interacting participants or the nature of the information that the learner must deal with), it is possible to manipulate the strategies that learners will need to employ in order to complete the task. Thus, by setting task goals and implementing task sequences in recognition of the competing requirements of accuracy, complexity, and fluency, a balanced development between these three requirements can take place.

Principal to Skehan's discussion on the cognitive bases of second language acquisition is the assumption that after the so-called "critical period," second language learners no longer have access to the Language Acquisition Device with which they learned their first language; hence, second language learning is general cognitive learning. "Modularity" exists only in terms of the information-processing *stages* in post-critical period second language learning, which is fundamentally different from the modularity between syntax and semantics in first language learning. In second language learning, as general cognitive learning, claims Skehan, individual differences in terms of aptitude, learning style, and learning strategies play significant roles that find no counterpart in first language acquisition and processing.

Based on the proposed three processing stages of input, central processing, and output, Skehan suggests three corresponding aptitude factors: *phonemic coding ability, language analytic ability*, and *memory*. "Phonemic coding ability" deals with the segmentation of sounds and the conversion of auditory material into *processable input* for later analysis. This ability is particularly important at the beginning stage of language learning. "Language analytic ability" concerns patterning and rule formation. This ability is important at all stages. "Memory," in Skehan's system, refers primarily to the above-mentioned "exemplar-based" component of the dual-mode processing system. This is the ability that enables "exceptional language learners" to attain native-like selection and native-like fluency, and plays its most important role primarily at the advanced level.

Finally, Skehan clarifies the diffused research area of "learning styles" by distinguishing *process* and *representation* and relating them to information processing stages. While the "aptitudinal" aspect of individuals' differences is hard to change, claims Skehan, individual differences in language learning *style* and *strategy* can be modified relatively easily. The remedy he offers to incorporate these individual differences in terms of aptitude and learning strategies is "project work." According to Skehan, by designing project work properly, accuracy, fluency, and complexity can all be maximized. For instance, during the execution of "appropriate pre-task activities, and careful task implementation, followed by high priority being attached to post-task reflection activities, a great deal of variation in the focus of attention is possible" (p. 271). Skehan argues that curriculum and syllabus design should orient the learners toward creativity and openness to change in this respect so that individual students become autonomous, responsible learners while developing effective strategy use.

Skehan's language learning model is clearly the most cognitive one in the current field of second language acquisition research; however, reading *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning* makes me wonder how big the gap is between such psycholinguistic/cognitive research and the reality of teaching and learning in a foreign language classroom. In order to operationalize such thoughtful, clearly argued scholarship, and in order to endeavor to implement its pedagogical application, fairly ideal conditions have to be assumed. For example, a course based on Skehan's model must have a clearly determined and agreed-upon goal, the learners must be active, and the teacher must be willing to negotiate the structure of the course to match the students' often conflicting educational needs and desires. In addition, the course must have access to an appropriate assessment system that can effectively reflect the learners' progress rather than what the teacher believes students should know.

One of the problems with implementing such a program is that the majority of Skehan's justifations for task-based instruction are theoretical: the author does not provide concrete case studies of how actual learning takes place, or how second language learners' interlanguage systems are changed or restructured through the activities he suggests. Most importantly, we do not yet know how effective Skehan's "processing" approach may turn out to be—a caveat which Skehan himself refers to in acknowledging the need for further research.

Nonetheless, Skehan's book suggests an innovative and potentially important framework for pedagogical application in second language learning, second language teaching, and second language assessment. It remains to be seen how future research into cognitive processing and proficiency development may validate or repudiate its novel claims.

REFERENCES

Krashen, S. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis*. London: Longman.

Long, M. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. Gass and C. Madden (Eds.), *Input and Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second language learning, conditions, processes, outcomes? *Language Learning, 44*, 493-527.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass and C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

The Cultural Origins of Human Cognition by Michael Tomasello.
Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999, 248 pp.

Reviewed by Swathi Vanniarajan
San Jose State University

The fields of cognitive psychology in general and linguistics in particular
underwent revolutionary changes when Noam Chomsky (1957, 1965, 1980) ar-
gued convincingly that linguistic structures are cognitive structures and that lin-
guistics is a branch of cognitive psychology. The argument that Chomsky advanced
in his 1957 *Syntactic Structures* (and which has been expanded upon by various
theorists since) claims that language is a biological endowment and that language
acquisition is a maturational process since all children, irrespective of intelligence
(and even in the presence of more general cognitive deficiencies, such as autism),
invariably acquire at least one language.

A fundamental tenet of Chomsky's "innateness" argument is that language
is species specific and that human beings are born with a dedicated cognitive mod-
ule containing the elements of a "Universal Grammar." Linguistic abilities are
thus separate from other cognitive abilities, and a Language Acquisition Device
resides within the human brain guaranteeing every newborn human child language.
In order to provide support for Chomsky's "genetic" view of language, theorists
such as Steven Pinker (1995, 1999) interpret recent findings in cognitive neuro-
science to suggest that "grammar" resides in the human brain in the form of "rules"
in one area and in the form of more idiosyncratic aspects of language such as
"lexicon" in another area.

Chomsky's innatist theories of language, however, have come under attack
in recent years from both practitioners of cognitive psychology (particularly the
connectionist and information processing approaches to language) and from prac-
titioners of social-cognitive psychology.

In his 1999 book *The Cultural Origins of Human Cognition,* Michael
Tomasello, a social-cognitive psychologist, makes the case for a social-cognitive
psychological view of language and language acquisition by arguing against many
of Chomsky's theoretical premises. Children use their cultural learning skills to
acquire linguistic and other communicative symbols, argues Tomasello, and lan-
guage develops in human beings as a result of their evolving cultural cognition
(both as individuals and as a species) and *not* as a result of a dedicated Language
Acquisition Device or innate Universal Grammar, as Chomsky claims. In
Tomasello's view, human social cognition has a dual role: it determines both indi-
vidual human language learning on the one hand, and the structural complexity of
all of the human species' languages on the other.

Tomasello begins his arguments by claiming that language is a social institution and that linguistic symbols are cultural symbols. His view is that "just as money is a symbolically embodied social institution that arose historically from previously existing economic activities, natural language is a symbolically embodied social institution that arose historically from previously existing social-communicative activities" (p. 94). Moreover, claims Tomasello, language is primarily intersubjective. If it is a cognitive skill, it is then a culturally-based cognitive skill with nothing but a social-collective dimension. In other words, language is the *product* of social or cultural transmission and communication, not the *cause* of it.

Tomasello thus takes great issue with Chomsky's claim that language is a biological endowment. From an evolutionary standpoint, argues Tomasello, the 250 thousand year history of *Homo sapiens* "is simply not sufficient, under any plausible evolutionary scenario, for genetic variation and natural selection to have created many different and independent, uniquely human cognitive modules" (p. 55). Furthermore, argues Tomasello, the localization of grammatical "rules" in one area of the brain cannot be accepted as evidence for the "innateness" of language, since localization of function in the brain may result from many different developmental processes *not* involving "genetic specification of epistemological content" (p. 203).

Tomasello's major criticism of Chomsky and his followers is that they tend to focus their attention entirely on the innateness of contemporary adult language use and are not looking at the evolutionary and intermediate processes in between. Their focus, he claims, is an "attempt to skip from the first page of the story, genetics, to the last page of the story, current human cognition, without going through any of the intervening pages. These theorists are thus in many cases leaving out of account formative elements in both historical and ontogenetic time that intervene between the human genotype and phenotype" (p. 204).

Accordingly, Tomasello does not subscribe to the assumption that it is the language faculty that separates human beings from other animals. In his opinion, it is our particular form of *intersubjective social cognition* that distinguishes human cognition from nonhuman cognition. To support this view, Tomasello cites research findings that human children before the age of nine months are very similar to nonhumans in terms of their social cognition in understanding that their actions and the actions of others create changes in the physical environment. Beginning at about nine months, however, human children start experiencing themselves and their conspecifics as intentional/mental agents.

This one cognitive differentiation, claims Tomasello, has many cascading effects. In fact, the sole reason why language emerges in children beginning at around nine months in all cultures, claims Tomasello, is precisely because children of all cultures seem to come to this understanding of others as mental agents at very roughly this age. In making this observation, Tomasello is particularly cautious not to posit the pre-existence of a dedicated language module in human

beings. Rather, he uses this claim to argue that it is the ability to understand each other as intentional mental agents that is species-unique and that which prepares human children to learn and use language.

Thus, what *are* genetic, from Tomasello's standpoint, are the cognitive *abilities* that are necessary for learning language and mathematics—not the linguistic structures or the mathematical notions themselves. Among these cognitive skills, he feels that what led human beings to invent language was "the biologically inherited capacity for living culturally" (p. 53).

Languages, according to Tomasello, share two important characteristics: intersubjectivity and social purpose. As such, Tomasello contends that "natural languages contain cognitive resources for partitioning the world into such things as events and their participants" (p. 9). Human language is perspectival by nature, claims Tomasello, and so is its use. Even grammaticization is a way of looking at the world—a way of "categorizing and schematizing cognitive representations"—and by using linguistic symbols, language users induce others to look at the world in their perspective: "in one way rather than in another" (pp. 127-128).

Thus, Tomasello argues against both the existence of Universal Grammar and the alleged role of a Language Acquisition Device in child language development. According to Tomasello, language development is entirely a cultural transmission process and collaborative learning takes place in the form of what he calls "joint attentional scenes." These primal experiences are defined by Tomasello as:

> social interactions in which the child and the adult are jointly attending to some third thing, and to one another's attention to that third thing, for some reasonably extended time .... On the one hand, joint attentional scenes are not perceptual events; they include only a subset of things in the child's perceptual world. On the other hand, joint attentional scenes are also not linguistic events; they contain more things than those explicitly indicated in any set of linguistic symbols .... [instead, these interactions constitute] an essential middle ground of socially shared reality-between the larger perceptual world and smaller linguistic world. (p. 97)

In other words, "there are no other hidden principles, parameters, linguistic categories, or schemas that generate sentences" (p.139). Children progress in their language learning only through the growing complexity of their social relations and through the correspondingly increasing complexity of the social cognition that results; for again, grammaticization is a way of looking at the world.

In this sense, the cognitive development of language in the individual recapitulates the cognitive development of language in the species. Language is a product of cumulative cultural evolution and in this evolutionary process, there is a ratchet-like mechanism that prevents slippage to the past. As such, the state of a language at any given time represents "something resembling the entire collective wisdom of the entire social group throughout its entire cultural history" (p. 7). This collaboration, claims Tomasello, is both simultaneous and historical across genera-

tions, for "modern adult cognition of the human kind is the product not only of genetic events taking place over many millions of years in evolutionary time but also of cultural events taking place over many tens of thousands of years in historical time and personal events taking place over many tens of thousands of hours in ontogenetic time" (p. 216).

Thus, Tomasello's theory of language is a social-pragmatic one, and his view of language learning can also be called a social-pragmatic model of language learning. The strengths of this elaborate treatise are the painstaking counter-proposals Tomasello offers to virtually every premise of innatism and to Universal Grammar. Yet this is also the book's major weakness since the arguments seem to lack focus and, at times. it is difficult to discern what the author is striving for.

Moreover, some of his arguments are not convincing enough. For example, Tomasello argues that language is the result of human beings' ability to socialize and therefore what is innate must be the ability for social cognition and not language. The counterargument can be as follows: Human beings are endowed with an ability to smell, and the nose has the function of smelling. What, then, is "innate" in the biological structure of human beings—the nose or the ability to smell? the form or the function? Perhaps both are innate since one cannot exist without the other.

Overall, *The Cultural Origins of Human Cognition* seems to be more successful as an elaboration of a hypothesis regarding how cultural development in children leads to language acquisition than it is as a treatise on the ontology and the phylogeny of the cultural aspects of human cognition. Tomasello does succeed in establishing his viewpoint that any theory of language or of language learning must have a social-pragmatic-cognitive dimension to it. Without one, indeed, no theory of language would be adequate to explain both what makes our present languages structurally complex systems, and how and why children grow up to have a similar perspective as members of their social groups without even knowing it!

Tomasello's book is a valuable resource to anyone interested in learning about how culture and language develop hand in hand and how human social cognition has played a significant role in the invention of human language.

REFERENCES

Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Mouton.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *The aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1980). Rules and representations. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 3,* 1-61.

Pinker, S. (1995). *The language instinct: How the mind creates language.* New York: Morrow.

Pinker, S. (1999). *Words and rules: The ingredients of language.* New York: Basic Books.

CORRECTION

Huang, C. (1999). Tense and aspect marking by L2 learners of English and native English speakers: Inherent lexical aspect and unitary vs. repeated situation types. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 10,* 113-130.

The following note was omitted from this article. This note pertains to the discussion of data in the methods section on page 118.

1. The data were taken from Roger Andersen's interlanguage database, collected and transcribed by students taking his Interlanguage Analysis Seminar at the University of California, Los Angeles between 1988 and 1992.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

Journals*:*
Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 20, 2000
Applied Linguistics, 20, 4, December, 1999
Applied Linguistics, 21, 1, July, 2000
ELT Journal, 54, 3, April, 2000
*Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 21,*1, 2000
International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 37, 3, August, 1999
RELC Journal, 30, 2, December, 1999
TESOL Canada Journal, 17, 2, Spring, 2000
TESOL Quarterly, 34, 1, Spring, 2000
TESOL Quarterly, 34, 2, Summer, 2000
University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 15, 1, Fall, 1999

Books:
Batchelor, R. E., & Offord, M. H. (2000) *Using French: A guide to contemporary usage* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Borsley, R. & Przepiorkowski, A. (1999). *Slavic in head-driven phrase structure grammar.* Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications
Censoz, J., & Jessner, U. (Eds.). (2000). *English in Europe: The acquisition of a third language.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Chiat, S. (2000). *Understanding children with language problems.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Davies, P., & Pearse, E. (2000). *Success in English teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Dickens, J., & Watson, J. (1999). *Standard Arabic: An advanced course.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Fehringer, C. (1999). *Reference grammar of Dutch.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Fox, B., Jurafsky, D., & Michaelis, L. (1999). *Cognition and Function in Language.* Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications
Harré, R., Brockmeier, J., & Mühlhäusler, P. (1999). *Greenspeak: a study of environmental discourse.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Kager, R., van der Hulst, H., & Zonneveld, W. (Eds.). (1999). *The prosody morphology interface.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Koenig, J. (1999). *Lexical Relations.* Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications
Larson-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (2nd ed.).
Lyons, C. (1999). *Definiteness.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
McMahon, A. (2000). *Lexical phonology and the history of English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Restal, G. (2000). *An introduction to substructural logics.* London: Routledge.
Schmidt, R., Sr. (2000). *Language policy and identity politics in the United States.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Teschner, R., & Evans, E. (2000). *Analyzing the grammar of English: A brief undergraduate textbook* (2nd ed.). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press
Windeatt, S., Hardisty, D., & Eastment, D. (2000). *The internet.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Issues in Applied Linguistics
SUBSCRIPTIONS

Volume 11, 2000
☐ **Number 1** SPECIAL ISSUE: Nonnative Discourse
☐ **Number 2** SPECIAL ISSUE: Topic to be announced

Volume 12, 2001
☐ **Number 1** GENERAL ISSUE: Topic to be announced
☐ **Number 2** SPECIAL ISSUE: Topic to be announced

Payment must be made by check or money order in U.S. funds. The following rates are per issue. Please double the amount if ordering a complete volume.

CURRENT RATES: (per issue)
☐ Student $7.50   ☐ Individual $15.00   ☐ Institution $20.00

Shipping: Please include the appropriate fee and check one of the boxes below.
☐ Inside the US no charge   ☐ Interational (surface) $2.50 (per issue)
          ☐ International Air Mail $7.50 (per issue)

NEW RATES: (per issue) Effective as of Volume 12 (2001)
☐ Student $10.00   ☐ Individual $18.00   ☐ Institution $30.00

Shipping: Please include the appropriate fee and check one of the boxes below.
☐ Inside the US $4.00 (per issue)   ☐ Interational (surface) $6.00 (per issue)
          ☐ International Air Mail $14.00 (per issue)

Amount Enclosed: $_____
(Make checks payable to **Issues in Applied Linguistics**. We regret that we cannot accommodate credit card orders at this time.)

Name _____

Address _____

_____

Telephone/FAX _____

E-Mail _____

Prepayment is required, so please mail your check and this form to:
Issues in Applied Linguistics, UCLA-Applied Linguistics/TESL,
3300 Rolfe Hall, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1531, U.S.A.

Please direct subscription questions to <ial2@humnet.ucla.edu>

ial Back Issues

Did you miss an issue of **Issues in Applied Linguistics**? Update your collection by checking the boxes below and filling out the form on the back.

☐ **Volume 1, Number 1**   Includes the following articles:
  Towards a Critical Applied Linguistics for the 1990's by Alastair Pennycook
  An Interview with Evelyn Hatch by Maria M. Egbert

☐ **Volume 1, Number 2**   Includes general articles as well as:
  SPECIAL FEATURE ROUNDTABLE:
  Defining Our Field: Unity in Diversity

☐ **Volume 2, Number 1**   Includes general articles as well as:
  SPECIAL FEATURE ROUNDTABLE: *Language Education,*
  Language Acquisition: Working Perspectives by Four Applied Linguists
  Leo van Lier, John Povey, Brian K. Lynch, John Schuman

☐ **Volume 2, Number 2**   SPECIAL ISSUE
  Socialization Through Language and Interaction
  Guest Editor, Elinor Ochs

☐ **Volume 3, Number 1**   Includes general articles as well as:
  SPECIAL FEATURE ROUNDTABLE:
  Preparing Applied Linguists for the Future

☐ **Volume 3, Number 2**   SPECIAL ISSUE
  The Neurobiology of Language
  Guest Editor, John Schumann

☐ **Volume 4, Number 1**   GENERAL ISSUE

☐ **Volume 4, Number 2**   SPECIAL ISSUE
  Ethical Issues for Applying Linguistics
  Guest Editors, Jeffrey Connor-Linton and Carolyn Temple Adger

☐ **Volume 5, Number 1**   GENERAL ISSUE

☐ **Volume 5, Number 2**   SPECIAL ISSUE
  Applied Linguistics from an East Asian Perspective

☐ **Volume 6, Number 1**   SPECIAL ISSUE
  Sociolinguistics and Language Minorities

☐ **Volume 6, Number 2**   SPECIAL ISSUE
Discourse Based Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition

☐ **Volume 7, Number 1**   SPECIAL ISSUE
*Proceedings from the First UCLA Conference on Language, Interac
tion, and Culture*

☐ **Volume 7, Number 2**   SPECIAL ISSUE
Applied Linguistics and Education

☐ **Volume 8, Number 1**   SPECIAL ISSUE
*Proceedings from the Second UCLA Conference on Language, Interac-
tion, and Culture*

☐ **Volume 8, Number 2**   SPECIAL ISSUE
*Proceedings from the Third UCLA Conference on Language, Interaction,
and Culture*

☐ **Volume 9, Number 1**   GENERAL ISSUE

☐ **Volume 9, Number 2**   SPECIAL ISSUE
The Organization of Participation

☐ **Volume 10, Number 1** GENERAL ISSUE

☐ **Volume 10, Number 2** GENERAL ISSUE

back issues order form

Please mark on the front of this form which issues you would like to purchase. The following rates are per issue.

CURRENT RATES: (per issue)
☐ Student $7.50   ☐ Individual $15.00   ☐ Institution $20.00

Shipping: Please include the appropriate fee and check one of the boxes below.
☐ Inside the US-No Charge   ☐ Interational (surface) $2.50 (per issue)
        ☐ International Air Mail $7.50 (per issue)

NEW RATES: (per issue) Applies to orders postmarked after January 30, 2001
☐ Student $10.00   ☐ Individual $18.00   ☐ Institution $30.00

Shipping: Please include the appropriate fee and check one of the boxes below.
☐ Inside the US $4.00 (per issue)   ☐ Interational (surface) $6.00 (per issue)
        ☐ International Air Mail $14.00 (per issue)

Amount Enclosed: $_____
(Make checks payable to **Issues in Applied Linguistics.** We regret that we cannot accommodate credit card orders at this time.)

Name_____

Address _____

_____

Telephone/FAX _____

E-Mail _____

Prepayment is required, so please mail your check and this form to:
Issues in Applied Linguistics, UCLA-Applied Linguistics/TESL,
3300 Rolfe Hall, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1531, U.S.A.
Please direct back order questions to <ial2@humnet.ucla.edu>

$20 Service charge for all returned checks.

Information for Contributors

ial is a refereed scholarly journal published by the graduate students of the UCLA Department of Applied Linguistics & TESL. Our aim is to publish outstanding research from students, faculty, and independent researchers in the broad areas of discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, language acquisition, language analysis, language assessment, language education, language use, and research methodology. We are particularly interested in publishing new departures and cross-disciplinary applied linguistic research.

Contributions, including book reviews, interviews, and articles, should be submitted in three copies and sent to Leah Wingard, Editor, *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, Applied Linguistics & TESL, UCLA, 3300 Rolfe Hall, P.O. Box 951531, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1531.

Manuscripts must be printed double spaced (including the references, examples, etc.) on one side only of white 8 1/2 x 11 or A4 paper and use black printing ink. Please attach a cover sheet with the following information: a) the full title of your paper, b) your name, c) name and address of your institution (or other address where you can best be reached), d) your phone number (work and home), FAX number and E-mail address (if any), and e) short title of your paper (for running head). The first page must include an abstract of the article which is less than 150 words. Authors should also supply a biographical note of approximately 50 words.

Essential notes should be indicated by superscript numbers and printed at the end of the article (but before the references).

References and citations should be made using APA Format: for example. (Cazden, 1988, p. 53), or (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). A series of references should be listed in alphabetical order: for example. (Cazden, 1988; Goodlad, 1984, Lemke, 1991), or (Long, 1996; Long & Porter, 1985). A series of references for the same author or authors should be ordered in chronological order as follows: (Hall, 1993, 1995, 1997). Use letters a. b. c to distinguish citations of different works by the same author in the same year. All references cited in the text must be listed in the references list alphabetically. For for more information, please see the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, Fourth Edition*.

Submission of an article or book review is taken to imply that the manuscript has not been previously published or submitted simultaneously to another publication. If a related article has been published elsewhere, this should be noted. Acceptance of articles will be contingent on the assignment of copyrights to the UC Regents, the publisher of *ial*.

CALL FOR PAPERS

ial is a refereed journal published by the graduate students of UCLA's Department of TESL and Applied Linguistics. We are particularly interested in publishing new departures and cross-disciplinary applied linguistic research. In the past we have published quality work on all of the following topics:

Discourse Analysis	Language and the Brain
Functional Grammar	Second Language Acquisition
Language Socialization	Language Education
Bilingual Education	Research Methodology
Sociolinguistics	Conversation Analysis
Professional Ethics	Language Minorities

ial has also published book reviews and interviews with notable applied linguistics scholars. To submit your manuscript, please send three copies to the following address:
Editor
Issues in Applied Linguistics
UCLA Department of Applied Linguistics
3300 Rolfe Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1531   E-mail: ial@humnet.ucla.edu
For more information please visit our website at
http://www.humnet.ucla.edu/humnet/teslal/ial

ANNOUNCEMENT: The Evelyn Hatch Award Fund

Moneys from the Evelyn Hatch Award Fund at UCLA are now used to recognize and reward the efforts of the editor(s) of *Issues in Applied Linguistics* with a modest annual honorarium.

If you would like to support these efforts, please make a tax-deductible contribution to the Hatch Award Fund. Send your check or money order made out to "UC Regents" and ear-marked for the Hatch Award to:
Ms. Mila August, MSO
Department of Applied Linguistics & TESL
UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1531

If you have any questions about the Award, you can contact Professor Marianne Celce-Murcia at the above address or on e-mail at celce-m@humnet.ucla.edu.

BOOK REVIEWS

A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning
Peter Skehan
Reviewed by Emi Morita

The Cultural Origins of Human Cognition
Michael Tomasello
Reviewed by Swathi Vanniarajan